UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A FEMINIST POSTSTRUCTURALIST READING OF ADVENTURE OUTDOOR EDUCATION

BY

JUDY DAVIDSON ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **MASTER OF ARTS**.

DEPARTMENT OF **PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT STUDIES**

Edmonton, Alberta
FALL 1994

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-94852-3

Canada

Name Judy Davidson

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Physical Education
SUBJECT TERM

0 5 2 3
SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523
Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578
Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996
Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575
Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984
Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **Judy Davidson**

TITLE OF THESIS: **A Feminist Poststructuralist Reading of Adventure Outdoor Education**

DEGREE: **Master of Arts**

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: **1994**

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Judy Davidson

6406 - 111A Street
Edmonton, AB
T6H 3H6

October 3, 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **A FEMINIST POSTSTRUCTURALIST READING OF ADVENTURE OUTDOOR EDUCATION** submitted by **JUDY DAVIDSON** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **MASTER OF ARTS**.

Dr. M. Ann Hall

Daphne J Read

Dr. Daphne Read

Dr. Debra Shogan

David J. Whitson

Dr. David Whitson

OCTOBER 3, 1994

I dedicate this thesis to Michael (Mick) Hanson.
I can only hope that it is not to his memory, but to his complete recovery-
physically, psychologically, and psychically.

Abstract

Outdoor education is currently based on many different theoretical foundations, drawing from several disciplines and employing a number of research methodologies. Generally, the discipline of outdoor education tends to borrow heavily from various types of psychology, developing its own models of adventure outdoor education which beget others. This work involves understanding the underlying epistemological assumptions in adventure outdoor education (AOE), specifically concentrating on Outward Bound (OB) and an OB-inspired program model called adventure based counselling (ABC). In this thesis, the poststructural theory of Michel Foucault and Judith Butler is used to analyze AOE (using Outward Bound and adventure based counselling as exemplars of that discourse) as it contributes to the disciplining of the subject. Highlighted are some of the effects of AOE practices, including how hegemonic power relations are reproduced and concomitantly how possibilities are produced for disruptions to those power relations through alternative understandings of subjectivity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ann Hall for being my advisor to this project and acknowledge my other committee members, Debra Shogan, Daphne Read, and David Whitson. Heartfelt thanks to Debra and Daphne for many confidence-inspiring and thoughtful conversations, and for insightful comments on many drafts of the thesis.

To Pat Davidson and Gladys McCalla for unfailing support, to Michelle Davidson and Laurie Davidson for their sardonic humour and larger perspectives, and to Bob Davidson for his cynicism.

I would like to thank Jean Noble for introducing me to queer theory, being a wonderful resource, and supporting me in my work. Throughout this project, Brenda Grace provided levity, a helping hand, and a willingness to listen to me whine.

And finally, but most importantly, to Yvonne Mireau for practical and emotional support- for being my editor par excellence, doing the dishes, cooking supper, paying the mortgage, picking up the pieces and always being there. This is for her with love.

Table of Contents

Chapter One - An Introduction to the Study....1

- Defining Adventure Outdoor Education....1
- Critique of Outdoor Education Literature....8
- Personal History in Outdoor Education....13
- Theoretical Framework....17
- Outline of Thesis....19

Chapter Two - Outward Bound as Social Regulation....22

- The Work of Michel Foucault....23
  - History and Foucault....23
  - Power-Knowledge Nexus....26
  - Repressive Hypothesis....27
  - Microphysics of Power....29
  - Disciplinary Techniques....30
  - Docile Bodies....33
  - Specific Intellectuals....35
- The "Emergence" of Outward Bound as Discipline....36
- The Modern Individual as Object....40
- The Modern Individual as Subject....47

Chapter Three - Adventure Based Counselling: Subjectivity and Subjectification....53

- The Emergence of Psychology's Subject....55
- The Discipline of Psychology....59
- The Individual/Society Dualism....61
- Gender and Psychological Discourse....63
- Adventure Based Counselling and Psychological Regulation....69

Chapter Four - Gender Performativity and the Family Metaphor in ABC....82

- Production of Subjectivity Through Language....86
- Judith Butler and Gender Performativity....89
- Adventure Based Counselling and the Family Metaphor....95

Chapter Five - Summary and Strategies....108

References....111

Chapter One

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Adventure outdoor education is a popular and powerful form of education. Its leaders place individuals in unique outdoor settings, engage them in exciting and often enjoyable forms of "risk" activities (such as rock climbing or kayaking), and assist participants to draw out important personal developments. Adventure outdoor educators claim that outdoor activities involving some form of risk (actual or perceived) and pushing personal "comfort" zones create influential, formative experiences for individuals.

Defining Adventure Outdoor Education

Outdoor education has established itself as a form of experiential education. The term experiential is used to draw attention to the "doing" or "being in the field" focus that this genre of learning espouses. The outdoor education/ leadership area has attempted to co-opt the term experiential as its own. An example of this is the Association for Experiential Education which is the best recognized North American organization for outdoor education, and includes practitioners and academics in its membership. From my perspective, I would position outdoor education as one form of experiential education, and not conflate the two terms.

There are two main strands that make up outdoor education: adventure education and environmental education. Adventure outdoor education (AOE) can be delineated from environmental outdoor education (those enterprises which involve understanding the value and operation of various ecosystems in which outdoor activities take place). Adventure outdoor education typically involves outdoor pursuits and concentrates on intrapersonal (effects within an individual) and interpersonal (interactions between individuals) relationships. It purports to "bring about positive changes in individuals through overcoming wilderness challenges" (Priest, 1986, p.14). Risk recreation, high risk outdoor pursuits, Outward Bound experiences, and adventure challenge are all programs associated under the rubric of adventure outdoor education. Individuals in the field may refer to this same area as outdoor education, wilderness education or adventure education as well. I will use the AOE designation throughout this analysis.

It is an artificial distinction to separate adventure from environmental education because the two often co-exist in the field and it could be argued that they are one and the same. However, much of the research I have looked at distinguishes between the two, and my analysis is specific to many of the assumptions used in AOE research and practices.

AOE is predicated on creating situations in which overcoming challenge and/or risk through engaging in outdoor pursuits such as backpacking, whitewater canoeing, rock climbing, caving, or backcountry skiing is undertaken. What is unique about AOE is its attempts to educate through outdoor adventure. An individual "deliberate[ly] seek[s] risk and uncertainty of outcome" to come to a fuller understanding of her/himself (Ewert, 1989, p.8). That risk may be physical, social, psychological/emotional, or spiritual (Miles and Priest, 1990).

The defining characteristics of AOE are:

> that a conscious and overt goal of the adventure is to expand the self, to learn and grow and progress toward the realization of the human potential... The teaching of skills is not the primary educational goal of the enterprise. The learnings about the self and the world that come from engagement in such activities are the primary goals (Miles and Priest, 1990, p.1).

With these aims in mind, AOE research literature has set out to demonstrate that psychological constructs such as self-concept, self-actualization, stress management abilities, and achievement motivation, among others, are improved in AOE participants (Ewert, 1989). This is supported theoretically through borrowing widely but selectively from various psychological discourses. Ewert claims that the learning process and learner outcomes are enhanced in the AOE experience through five interrelated characteristics: the emergence of shared meanings within the group; a spirit of cooperation; dealing with dissonance and uncertainty in constructive ways; encouraging/requiring high levels of engagement; and leading from behind.

AOE purports to be a more complete form of education than mainstream education because it does more than develop people intellectually within the confines of four classroom walls. Traditional education "underemphasizes the physical and emotional aspects of students and ignores the critical questions of self-image and relationships between people" (Greene and Thompson, 1990, p.6). In small group settings where immediate feedback can be given to the individual engaged in unique activities, the experiential aspect of AOE is purported to be an effective educational alternative (Ewert, 1989). It also frees individuals to "get back to nature", and enjoy a more simplistic way of living, escaping their very ordered and rationalized lives for a short time.

With personal development and its attendant processes as goal focuses, AOE leaps to establish a utopic global vision:

> The modern world is faced with great problems, and only by stretching and reaching and extending limits will human ability to solve these problems be realized. Adventure education helps in this great work (Miles and Priest, 1990, p.3).

Another author enthuses, "there are limited opportunities to exercise personal freedom so dramatically in the world today" as through AOE participation (Meier *et al*, 1987, p.7). The liberal assumption of a competent individual as the AOE participant colludes to ensure that sexism, racism, classism, and homophobia remain unexamined within AOE contexts. AOE programs in the North American context were originally designed for young, white, straight, middle-class men or male youth (Meier *et al*, 1987). Although many other individuals have participated in AOE programs, the original social values are reasonably intact and deeply ingrained in programs as "common sense".

Specific programs have developed and fall under the AOE rubric. Two examples of these are Outward Bound, and an OB-inspired enterprise called Project Adventure where the practice of adventure based counselling (ABC) was primarily developed. Both of these are recognized as established and respected AOE programs (Ewert, 1989; Miner, 1990). Both OB and ABC techniques have been adopted and consequently adapted by many organizations in many educational contexts. The borrowing outside the boundaries of specific Outward Bound or Project Adventure contexts can be interpreted as a measure of their success.

The three terms AOE, OB, and ABC designate different things but they are also very interdependent and mutually informing. Sometimes the three terms refer to the same types of practices. I have chosen to work with them by moving from the most general (AOE), to a more specific programmatic regime (OB), and ending with a direct interpretation of counselling techniques within a program application (ABC). In my analysis, I use findings and assumptions found in the research literature, in addition to actual program practices. I have decided not to separate the two as they are inextricably related. "Discourse is not restricted to writing or speaking, but is also social action" (Butler, 1990, p.166). AOE as discourse can be analyzed using both what is written about it (the research literature) and what is actually done `on trail' (actual AOE practices).

The historical roots of outdoor adventure vary, depending on how adventure is defined. Some theorists have taken it right back to ancient times and cursorily traced it to the present day (Ewert and Hollenhurst, 1990). However, the genesis of outdoor adventure education is usually posited during the Second World War when Kurt Hahn opened the Gordonstoun Boys' School in Scotland (Kraft, 1985). Hahn, as the "Father" of Outward Bound (OB), has had a profound influence on AOE. Outward Bound is the most "studied" program within AOE, and there are several historical accounts of the organization, its programs, and other programs influenced by its philosophy (Ford, 1981; Ewert, 1989; Miles and Priest, 1990; Watters, 1984). There are also testimonial and anecdotal texts from participants and journalistic observers (Godfrey, 1980; Miner and Boldt, 1981).

The first Outward Bound school in North America opened in 1962 in Colorado. It has since spread around the world and there are eight schools operating currently in North America:

> Outward Bound conducts courses of a highly strenuous, physically and mentally challenging nature in remote wilderness areas. In this environment, the challenges, mostly physical, are unique for all participants. The wilderness is a classroom. It allows students to become aware of the interdependency of all life. As a teaching medium, the wilderness provides a metaphor for the individual to develop self-confidence, concern for others, and self awareness as well as a sensitivity to our fragile environment (Greene and Thompson, 1990, p.5).

A standard course at OB is between 21 and 26 days long and includes such elements as a three-day solo experience, rock climbing, rappelling, a community service element, physical conditioning, instruction in technical skills, and a final expedition that is student-planned and student-led. Group size is small, varying between 8 and 12 individuals. Each OB school follows a standard curriculum that varies depending upon the season and geographical location (Greene and Thompson, 1990).

I will use Outward Bound to refer to a general program model and attendant practices that have been developed by Outward Bound Incorporated. I use OB to refer to these general practices which are not necessarily specific to Outward Bound Incorporated. Standard Outward Bound courses have been very successful and have been adapted by OB and hundreds of other organizations to meet other needs. Different client groups (e.g., older adults, youth at risk, persons with differing physical abilities, corporate executives), shorter and longer time periods, and agencies outside of Outward Bound have all modified the methods and principles to serve their purposes (Meier *et al*, 1987; Greene and Thompson, 1990).

Adventure based counselling (ABC) is a counselling method and formula developed at Project Adventure in Massachusetts. ABC is a direct spinoff from Outward Bound programs, where the intensity, duration and cost of the long wilderness programs developed in North America could not be undertaken in more modest school, counselling, and/or helping profession contexts. ABC was first developed through a program called Project Adventure and has since developed into a set of practices used in many different contexts and forms of outdoor education and other alternative educational sites. It still retains the OB tenets that learning through experience and engaging in some form of community service are the best forms of education to develop good citizens.

The basic premise of this program is that by confronting challenge experiences through outdoor adventure and risk activities, an individual will gain personal meaning and self-perspective. It is a form of group counselling where the group is led through a series of "trust" activities which then facilitate an environment for interpersonal confrontation to promote personal growth. Improving self-concept through activities designed to build trust, set goals, challenge/stress, provide peak experiences and develop problem solving skills is the main focus and thrust of the program. This is attempted through a series of different activities which follow the framework of briefing the activity, leading it, and debriefing afterwards.

Adventure based counselling is comprehensively discussed in the book Islands of Healing: A Guide to Adventure Based Counselling published by Project Adventure Incorporated. The theoretical basis provided for ABC follows the theories of humanistic psychology, in particular that of Carl Rogers and Kurt Lewin and their ideas of self-concept. The administrators at Project Adventure have evaluated the effectiveness of ABC using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) which was developed by William Fitts. The work done by these psychological theorists/researchers is not presented in any great detail. My reading of the theory section of Islands of Healing is that it is superficial and undertheorized. As I now outline, this is a problem in AOE literature generally.

Critique of Outdoor Education Literature

The research I have read discusses the great benefits of risk activities in promoting self-esteem, transferring positive social skills back to urban environments, and reducing recidivism among young offenders (e.g., Klint, 1990; Laurence and Stuart, 1990; Wright, 1987). However, I have rarely known the purported benefits to be realized in the long term. Gender, class, race, and sexual orientation are rarely mentioned, let alone seriously analyzed as endemic structural and systemic inequities. The subtle nuances of power and ideology do not appear to be incorporated into the theory. Academic outdoor education in particular has failed to position itself politically within socio-cultural matrices.

AOE theorists and practitioners perceive themselves as marginalized within institutions and society. Most adventure education programs exist after long and persistent efforts to gain institutional and public credibility. These experiential programs purport to be doing progressive and "cutting edge" educational work (Hanna, 1992). Partly, I think this is true. There is a type of "missionary zeal" that permeates most AOE literature, and I have been inculcated with that sense of earnestness in my training. The challenge for me has been to sift through the rhetoric and decide whether or not the theoretical underpinnings of AOE explain its educational potential, whether other frameworks could do it better, or if certain strategies in certain contexts would "interrupt" many of the mainstream assumptions underlying AOE. As AOE research literature and programs proliferate, it becomes more apparent that AOE is not necessarily a radical site of education. There are many mitigating factors that make each outdoor education program and experience a complex situation. Although the outdoor environment provides a unique medium, it does not guarantee that an ethically and politically sound pedagogy will occur.

Outdoor educators are beginning to realize that although they may perceive their "discipline" as marginalized, it has been somewhat exclusive in the sense of who has access to their programs and who is comfortable within them. Material is being written which discusses people of differing abilities, ethnic and cultural differences, racial minorities, and women in an attempt to be more inclusive.

The earliest attempts to include diversity seem to address the utility of outdoor adventure for special populations, especially the physically handicapped. In more recent publications, the "special populations" rubric has expanded to include survivors of various types of abuse, individuals of varying abilities, and young offenders (Peterson, 1987; Dattilo and Murphy, 1987). I have found little involving class analysis in AOE within the North American context, except attempts by Outward Bound to provide scholarships to those in need (Godfrey, 1980).

There is an effort to include those of "cultural and ethnic" variance, primarily through what I perceive to be the appropriation of rituals and practices from a subordinate culture by the hegemonic white, Eurocentric (AOE) culture (Raffan, 1992; Scott and Heine, 1992). There are calls for more participation by members of racial and ethnic minorities in AOE (Ashley, 1990; Couch, 1992). All of these attempts for diversity, and recognition of difference, seem to be appropriative and/or patronizing to me. There appears to be no attempt to place difference in its own context. The basic premise still seems to be that the AOE establishment (and its attendant values, practices, and membership) is the centre of the discussion, and difference is developed in accordance to that structure without making any substantial changes to it.[1]

The existing research on women and adventure outdoor education contains only discrete gender analysis within the existing AOE theoretical paradigm. The earliest piece was done in 1982 by Wilma Miranda and Rita Yerkes. In it they call for more research to be done on women's participation and experience in the outdoors. The authors generally follow the argument that gender is socialized through role expectations. They hypothesize that women seek out all-female outdoor experiences in order to "live in a stereotype-free environment and (have) the opportunity to set goals which may aid in the struggle toward independence and self-acceptance" (Miranda and Yerkes, 1982, p.83). They then go on to extrapolate how women can "escape" gender-imposed expectations by reuniting with and learning from nature.

In the mid-1980s, two threads of analysis appear which take Miranda and Yerkes' initial queries as transparent givens. First, there is a continued reliance on the assumptions of sex-role stereotyping, embellished with the use of Carol Gilligan's (1982) work on a female ethic of care, which universalizes women's experiences. These articles encourage the development of "women-centered" programming techniques based on this "theoretical foundation". There is an assumption that women can be given "free choice" within this framework, without any articulation of the real power differentials between leader (or in their rhetoric, guide and/or facilitator) and participants, and between participants. There is a weak attempt to acknowledge differences among individual women but the questions of what constitutes difference, and whether this "delighting in group diversity" is successful or damaging, are never carefully explored (Henderson and Bialeschki, 1986; Mitten, 1985; Warren, 1985).

The second thread of analysis involves the psychological construct of androgyny. Outdoor experiential educators flirted with this idea in the mid-1980s but recent literature seems to have dropped it. This literature attempts to establish an ideal non-gendered leader with the best of "feminine" and "masculine" traits. The quality of these articles is summed up in the following statement: "Research has shown that teachers can eliminate gender bias after four days of training designed to establish equity in their interactions with students" (Knapp, 1985, p.18). The appeal to a genderless ideal, in light of the most recent feminist theorizing, is naive and simplistic at best, and dangerous in the extreme (Henderson and Bialeschki, 1987; Kennison, 1989; Knapp, 1985). The androgyny concept is revisited in Chapter 3.

Research in the early 1990s does not incorporate much new material. It still relies on sex role assumptions, different moral development assumptions, and certain personality trait theories based on humanist assumptions. Women's experience is privileged in this literature, and experience is often implicitly considered transhistorical and universal (Gavey, 1989). This research tends toward an essentialist discourse that is problematically simplistic:

> The closeness of women and nature as evidenced by their shared cycles suggests a nurturing and important connection between the natural environment and females. It is clear that girls and women, today more than ever, are interested in the outdoors and are seeking to empower themselves through involvement in outdoor

activies (Henderson, 1992, p.49).

Empowerment through increasing self-esteem is the newest trend in the women and outdoor education literature (Bialeschki and Henderson, 1993; Mitten, 1992). This material does not address the economic privilege only certain women have to engage in these activities. For women who may receive funding or bursaries, the program framework is still very individualistic. Self-esteem problems are not considered as symptomatic of larger socio-political situations beyond the immediate control of less privileged women.

Women's experience is important to acknowledge but it is insufficient as a theoretical or epistemological base. "What could be truer, after all, than a subject's own account of what he or she has lived through?" (Scott, 1992, p.24). The appeal to experience as true creates several assumptions:

> The evidence of experience then becomes evidence for the fact of difference, rather than a way of exploring how difference is established, how it operates, how and in what ways it constitutes subjects who see and act in the world (Scott, 1992, p.25).

It naturalizes and decontextualizes the identity of the speaker without questioning what historical and discursive conditions create that experience and that subjectivity.

There is a growing body of literature on women's participation in risk outdoor activities. These are usually testimonial accounts that are not theoretical or part of a "proper" research project. Nevertheless, they are a valuable source for representations of women in adventure activities. This material, interpreted in different ways, could be extremely useful for developing potential subversive or resistive feminist strategies to disrupt many of the normalized patriarchal and heterosexist assumptions and practices common within AOE. (cf., Birkett and Peascod, 1989; Blum, 1980; da Silva, 1992; Kennedy, 1987; LaBastille, 1980; Niemi and Weiser, 1987; Tullis, 1986; Vause, 1990). If subjectivity is understood as being constructed in and through language/discourse, these written texts may be interpreted in new and interesting ways. Alternative renderings of subjectivity are discussed in Chapter 4.

My overview of outdoor education literature is partial. I have not covered every piece that has been produced under the AOE rubric. However, I do think that my critique generally holds true. AOE has not been reflexive or politicized in any rigorous, theoretical manner about the implications of how certain identity categories are erased and/or appropriated. The best attempts so far assume a liberal framework to include individuals of difference.[2] AOE research reproduces and recreates existing AOE values and assumptions, which parallel most dominant social power relations.

Personal History in Outdoor Education

I have been involved in outdoor education, and specifically adventure outdoor education, for the last dozen years. My interest in AOE started as being a participant at summer camp and is currently in analyzing it as an academic theorist. I have occupied many other positions such as administrator, counsellor, student, teacher, leader, programmer, and group member. Over that time my personal investment in adventure education has changed. When I was fourteen years old, it was the best thing I had ever done. I thought I could never get enough of the activities or the social and environmental context in which they took place. It then became paid work for me, and was my major area of study for my undergraduate degree. I worked as an administrator after my formal outdoor education degree was finished. Now I have moved to a place where I do not want to be an outdoor educator. The work is incredibly demanding and exhausting, often leading to staff burnout, and I have become disillusioned with what once promised to be a radical educational alternative. Presently, my engagement in outdoor activities is purely for personal enjoyment.

As a woman, I have struggled against many traditional assumptions held by most individuals engaged in outdoor education. As a member of mixed gender leadership teams, I have had to fight to open spaces for me to teach "hard" or technical skills rather than lead evening singsongs or debrief group activities. I bitterly remember being left in camp to do the breakfast cleanup while the male members went off to set up the rock climbs for the day's session. As a participant, I have suffered subtle negative comments about my abilities based on my sex. On all-female trips, I have experienced a very different group rapport than I have within co-ed groups. I have been involved in university programs where a male leader has stated unequivocally that women do not have the physical strength, personal stability or patience to carry out expeditions. As head instructor of an all-male teenage program, I have been berated with sexual innuendo and homophobic comments. As an administrator, I have been asked by male outdoor equipment suppliers if I'm "easy". The list goes on and on, paralleling many other traditional settings in which women engage.

Not only have I come to some understanding of my experiences within the AOE context, I have analyzed the potential effects of this discourse that are not generally acknowledged by its adherents and practitioners. For this reason, I have engaged a theoretical and textual analysis, rather than an "in the field" piece of social scientific research. On the other hand, I am not looking for a certain type of "outcome" or "effect" that an AOE experience will provide. Experiential programs may justify themselves in the positive experiences they provide, but using experiences as explanation does not make a critical project "evidence of experience... that takes meanings as transparent, reproduces rather than contests given ideological systems" (Scott, 1992, p.25).

My desire to understand AOE from a different theoretical stance stems from academic study in the area. I have wanted to seriously analyze the assumptions found in most AOE literature for some time. The majority of AOE studies rely on psychological constructs to develop, maintain, and justify their existence (Buell, 1983; Kraft, 1985; Ewert, 1983; Allen, 1987). One article outlines the debt that experiential education owes the Classical and Enlightenment philosophers and the traditional disciplines of anthropology and psychology (Kraft, 1985). In his article "Outdoor Adventure and Self-Concept: A Research Analysis", Alan Ewert surveys the AOE work in self-concept areas using a variety of personality tests and related diagnostic tools borrowed from psychology.

In the paper, the author does an historical overview of self-concept work within psychology, then describes self-concept as linked with academic achievement, and finally analyzes self-concept in relation to wilderness experiences and specifically Outward Bound programs. His findings assert that most studies on self-concept involving OB contain flawed research methods, and that the research literature has been unidimensional in focussing on outcome issues. He suggests that future research focus on "programmatic types of issues (length of course, activity mix, instructional staff)" to more clearly correlate what it is that OB does to create "good" results in participants (Ewert, 1983, p.27).

I was first introduced to this paper in an outdoor education graduate course that I audited three years ago. The "critical" discussion about this paper involved pointing out the sampling flaws and the methodological and statistical inconsistencies. The fundamental premises and assumptions underlying this work were not addressed. Self-concept was not questioned as a category, there was no consideration of what value implications that category entailed, and the scientific process was assumed to be the only appropriate mechanism with which to evaluate program effects this "black box" called Outward Bound was producing in people. There was absolutely no acknowledgement of socio-political context, gender, race, class, or sexual orientation in this work.

Behaviorist research presumes that it can categorize universal human traits and functions, assess them mechanistically, and be able to explain the behavior in the end. There is no acknowledgement that subjectivity is constructed in and through language and discourse and that these are not neutral mediums. Behaviorism assumes a universal subject that can be fully knowing and transparent to itself and others, as well as having the need to "progress" and "be better". What progress and betterment mean, or what that is based upon, is not discussed. There does not seem to be any analysis of structural inequities among different groups of people, power differentials within complicated social matrices, or historical conditions that do not create us all equally.

Work within feminist psychology has already decentered presumed beliefs about the androcentrism of much psychological work. The poststructuralist incursions into feminist psychology are transforming the understandings of subjectivity even more. This work is helpful in providing arguments to counter the myth of a universal AOE student and leader, which provides the basis for much of ABC theory and practice. (Wilkinson, 1986; Crawford and Marecek, 1989; Gavey, 1989;).

Theoretical Framework

I am interested in critical theory, particularly feminist and more recently, anti-foundationalist work (postmodernist and poststructuralist theory). This theory has challenged me to ask some basic questions of AOE. On whose behalf are these research claims made, for whose interests, and on what basis? Generally the research in the adventure education area has a positivist epistemological stance, and is typically based on behaviorist theory. It is dependent upon the assumptions within a liberal humanist framework. Here, I interrogate these underlying paradigms, and deconstruct them, exposing their often overlooked, hidden effects. Some of my experiences in outdoor education seem profoundly unfair, and therefore this project is also about making the personal, political.

Outdoor education is currently based on many different theoretical foundations, drawing from several disciplines and employing a number of research methodologies (Ewert, 1989; Hanna, 1992). Generally, the discipline of outdoor education tends to borrow heavily from various types of psychology, developing its own models of adventure outdoor education which beget others. My work involves understanding the underlying epistemological assumptions in AOE, specifically concentrating on Outward Bound and the OB-inspired program model, adventure based counselling (ABC). In this thesis, the poststructural theory of Michel Foucault and Judith Butler is used to analyze AOE (using Outward Bound and adventure based counselling as exemplars of that discourse) as it contributes to the disciplining of the subject. I highlight some of the effects of AOE practices, including how hegemonic power relations are reproduced and concomitantly how possibilities are produced for disruptions to those power relations through alternative understandings of subjectivity.

The work of Michel Foucault presently enjoys considerable academic cultural currency. When I started this project, much of my reading within feminist and poststructuralist theory referred to Foucault's work. I had not rigorously read any of his writing. This thesis has given me an opportunity to delve into his work and secondary sources about his work, and use it to analyze AOE. Although I do not think everything he suggests is "right", I am fascinated by his notions of social regulation, the micro-physics of power, his historicized accounts of the production of "modern" individuals, and the effects that modern institutions and their practices have in recreating and perpetuating modern social discourse.

I have used Judith Butler's work on gender performativity for three main reasons. Her theory of gender performativity, dependent upon many Foucaultian concepts, presents sex/gender as produced through discourse, and not determined by it. She clearly theorizes subjectivity and agency as non-essentialist concepts and addresses the materiality of bodies within her analysis. Secondly, her stand on identity politics is clear and workable. She acknowledges that identity categories must be retained for practical political reasons, but her work is not paralyzed by their everchanging meanings and definitions. She regards the constant change and tension in defining identity as necessarily positive and productive, enhancing political projects that use identity categories. Finally, I am drawn to Butler's work because it explicitly theorizes lesbian and queer experiences, and regards them as potentially political notions within gender discourse.

Feminist poststructuralism can mean many things. It is hotly contested and debated within current feminist theory. I cannot comprehensively define what it might mean. I have narrowed my use of theorists to make this analysis workable, choosing to use work by Foucault and Butler primarily.

Outline of Thesis

Earlier in my critique, I take AOE to task for not placing itself in a politicized social arena. In this thesis, I have placed AOE (through Outward Bound and adventure based counselling techniques) theoretically so that it is clearly situated within an ideological matrix/context. In Chapters Two and Three, I outline how the modern individual is treated both as object and subject within AOE discourse, and how these processes are not entirely separable within their dialectical relationship. Specifically, in Chapter Two, I undertake a Foucaultian analysis of how the modern individual is disciplined as both object and subject within OB practices. The character and uses of power as productive are discussed. In Chapter Three, the historical construction of psychological discourse is covered and its assumptions about the `acting, purposeful' subject are applied to selected ABC practices.

By introducing the decentered subject of psychoanalysis in Chapter Four, I subvert many of the claims of traditional subjectivity accounts to which AOE, OB, and ABC cling for legitimacy. I engage debates about gender "identity" politics to discuss Judith Butler's work on requisite gender performativity as necessary for "subjects" to become intelligible. The disruptions of heteronormative repetitions of gender make possible a "queer"[3] reading of the family metaphor invoked in Islands of Healing. This specific articulation is a form of contextual political resistance to AOE values and norms. These disruptions can be interpreted to formulate new, necessarily provisional and contingent, "postmodern" readings of the politics of adventure outdoor education (Butler, 1990; Butler, 1993).

There can be no overarching programmatic formula for politically revolutionizing AOE. That would imply "the danger of fixing and oversimplifying the ideas, thus presenting them in a potentially stagnant and deradicalized form in which they would be adopted as a new orthodoxy" (Gavey, 1989, p.60). Critiquing the existing paradigm is much easier to justify and do than trying to reconfigure or interrupt the existing theoretical framework. This is a partial and incomplete attempt to modify adventure outdoor education. In the final analysis, my fixed position will only ever be provisional, a moment in that state called "analysis interminable".[4]

Notes

1. A personal story may help to clarify this point. An outdoor education colleague I know had been working with a program in Toronto which took inner city youth and put them through an AOE-type regime. The majority of their participants were Black teens. A local Black youth advocacy organization refused to refer participants to this AOE program after it found out that the leaders of the adventure program were not speaking about Black people as role models in outdoor education. My colleague expressed to me his frustration with this demand, because, as everyone knew, there were no role models who were people of colour in outdoor education, so it was an impossible demand to fulfill. He was leaving this position in Toronto because he was tired of dealing with politically correct politics. Among other interpretations of this example, I use it to illustrate that the AOE program assumptions remain intact even when participants of different cultural and racial contexts are involved. This maintains hegemonic racial power relations and expectations. It never occurred to my colleague that perhaps the AOE program is not designed for Black youth, but for white North American populations, and that was the sticking point, not a vacuous charge of political correctness.

2. I use the phrase "individuals of difference" advisedly. Considering every individual is different from the mythic norm (which does not exist), it is a problematic expression. Without knowing a suitable alternative, I use the term individuals of difference to generally, and necessarily inadequately, refer to various different identity categories.

3. See Note 2 at the end of Chapter Three.

4. I thank Daphne Read for this expression.

Chapter Two

OUTWARD BOUND AS SOCIAL REGULATION

In this chapter, I do two things. The first is to map out theoretically how I understand Foucaultian genealogy and how that may be helpful in placing adventure outdoor education (AOE) as discourse. Second, I want to identify specific Outward Bound events and practices and analyze them with insights gained from Foucault's work developed through his genealogical analyses of education, psychology and disciplinary techniques. I do not intend to do a genealogy of Outward Bound in the strictest sense. I see AOE, and in this particular case Outward Bound (OB), as an extension and application of the already formulated modern discourse/discipline of education. I reconsider some implications of a small part of educational discourse with a different theoretical framework. Therefore, I use Foucault's work, and interpretations of his work by others, to place OB as a discursive formation, that which is open to interpretation and challenge. Foucault invites us to use any of his work as one might use tools in a toolbox (Gore, 1992). I will use various concepts developed by Foucault.

I want to demonstrate how the progress and development of OB has not really altered many of the disciplining techniques used in the 1940s and early 1950s at a private boys' school, and I want to understand how it has fully engaged in the modern task of discipline and order, masking and mutating its technologies as times change (Sarup, 1989). As I outlined in Chapter 1, OB has always prided itself on being an effective alternative to traditional educational discourses. It attempts to create situations where individuals can gain personal development through outdoor adventure experiences. This learning through doing is complemented with a strong community service component. I show that OB's practices are also complicit in the modernization project, producing "citizens" similar to those created in traditional education. As Foucault states, "my point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.231).

The Work of Michel Foucault

The work of Michel Foucault is difficult to categorize because it asks fundamentally new questions about various disciplines that have been constructed in the modern world. By doing a history of the present, Foucault "explicitly and self-reflectively begins with a diagnosis of the current situation", illustrating the effects of many of the modern disciplines, in particular the "pseudo" or social sciences (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.119). Rather than judging or evaluating how power is exercised in the modern world, he seeks to understand how it operates, how it has constructed, and continues to constitute the modern "disciplined" subject.

History and Foucault

His work is not a form of history, as historians would consider history. Foucault is not interested in revealing a truth, a way, or a natural unfolding of progressive events:

> The genealogist is opposed to a suprahistorical perspective that seeks to totalize history, to trace its internal development, to recognize ourselves in a comfortable way in the past, to offer the reassurance of an end toward which history moves (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.110).

Foucault traces modern social discourses (specifically education, psychology, penal institutional systems) by following them back to times of discontinuity, looking for an emergence, a disruption, rather than an origin or a cause. The events he traces were, in their own time, rather inconsequential. These ruptures, however, become important to understanding how modern forms of power and knowledge become enmeshed and legitimated in discourse (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983).

Foucault claims that history is only an interpretation of other interpretations:

> If interpretation is a never-ending task, it is simply because there is nothing to interpret. There is nothing absolutely primary to interpret because, when all is said and done, underneath it all everything is already interpretation (Foucault in Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.107).

Any one version of history creates many different possibilities of agency and knowledge. There is no "correct" version of history, no hidden meaning to be uncovered, just many interpretations forged from many possibilities and positions. Foucault attempts to show the contingency of cultural practices through a technique called archaeology. Systems are discursive events and as such, there are demonstrable limits to the legitimacy of knowledge(s). "Cultural practices are instituted historically and are therefore contingent, ungrounded except in terms of other, prior, contingent, historically instituted practices" (Fraser, 1989, p.19).

Foucaultian archeological analysis is the detailed look at the construction of discourses, including all the small, inconsequential events that disrupt the progress and development of seemingly seamless discursive formations. "Archaeology ... isolates and indicates the arbitrariness of the hermeneutic horizon of meaning". It might be characterized as undertaking a form of "bracketing" to do a detailed analysis of discourse-as-object, to be able to suspend certain "normative" epistemological and philosophical tenants to "demonstrate the discontinuit(ies) and shifts of meaning" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.106; see also Fraser, 1989).

In Foucault's later work, he seriously reconsidered the notion of power and its interplay with knowledge and truth (pouvoir-savoir). Genealogical analysis went further than archeology, in that he self-consciously theorized the uses and character of power as an integral part of the historical discourse.[1] Foucault "used variants of a strict analysis of discourse (archaeology) and paid a more general attention to that which conditions, limits, and institutionalizes discursive formations (genealogy)" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.104). Genealogy traces the dispersed forces (including knowledge) which impinge on the formation of discourses as they shift and dissolve in the production of those discourses (May, 1993). It requires patient attention to small and meticulous details, always questioning and reinterpreting the most minute event. In his book Discipline and Punish, Foucault recites almost *ad nauseam* and goes into gruesome detail about the conditions and circumstances of early penal institutions to make clear his genealogical analysis (1979).

Attempting to nail down, clarify, or identify a genealogical method is an extremely difficult, if not impossible task. Unlike his rules for archaeology, Foucault gives no step by step instructions for a genealogical process (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983). This would be consistent with his assertion that genealogy "rejects the metahistorical deployment of ideal significations and indefinite teleologies" (Foucault, 1984, p.77). Each genealogical study is specific to its area and complexities, and developing a "how-to" manual would be antithetical to Foucault's rejection of an *a priori* subject and/or historical process:

> The answer is to study discourses and practices, to determine the nature and extent of the constraints they impose, and to evaluate whether those constraints are acceptable or not...Agreement is always contingent upon the acceptance of some basic values (May, p.113).

The evaluation of those values and their truthfulness, will always be based on the contexts in which they occur and on which discourse is acceptable to those involved (Flax, 1992).

In typical fashion, Foucault and those who write about his work tend to describe and explain his concepts negatively, that is by what they are not. However, Todd May and Judith Butler are two theorists who do try to define genealogy. May (1993, p.114) claims the genealogical project "is a political critique of micropolitical practices". Butler (1993, p.282) adds her understanding: "Foucault's notion of genealogy is that it is a specifically philosophical exercise in exposing and tracing the installation and operation of false universals".

Power-Knowledge Nexus

There are several key concepts related to genealogical analysis in what Foucault refers to as the power/knowledge nexus. These must be explored to develop the background and framework for my analysis. These concepts include: one, the repressive hypothesis; two, juridico-discursive power; three, the microphysics of power; and four, disciplinary techniques and technologies of the self whose effects create docile bodies.

The power/knowledge nexus is crucial to understanding Foucault's form of historicity. He deconstructs the Enlightenment claim that truth is free from power, and demonstrates through highly detailed examples, how power and knowledge are inextricably linked and interdependent. The repressive hypothesis claims that "truth is intrinsically opposed to power and therefore inevitably plays a liberating role" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.127). Jane Flax (1992, p.452) suggests that "truth is an effect of discourse...and is discourse dependent". This supports Foucault's view that power, as exercised through discourse, is not separate, but inextricably linked to knowledge as a form of truth. Knowledge and power are not viewed as natural, pregiven entities, but as historically constructed contingencies, at once heterogeneous and mutually informing (May, 1993). Foucault argues against the repressive hypothesis through demonstrating how the use of power has fundamentally changed from Classical times to the present, without a concomitant change in how power is perceived and/or understood.

Repressive Hypothesis

The repressive hypothesis views power as negative, as exercising power over others. It is used to restrict individuals and place limits on their actions and movements. This kind of external demonstration of power is rooted in the Classical system of punishment. Public displays of repressive force (e.g., public floggings or stonings) signified power as residing within the sovereign. The recipient of this force was a visual and public signifier and reminder of the moral and commanding effects of that sovereign power. This blatantly crude demonstration and reinforcement of power gradually became more sophisticated and regulated.

Foucault argues that repressive power had developed into a "juridico-discursive" form by the Victorian age:

> Juridico-discursive power is domination. All it can do is forbid, and all it can command is obedience. Power, ultimately, is repression; repression, ultimately is the imposition of the law; the law, ultimately, demands submission (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.130).

Two reasons are cited as to why this formulation of power was and continues to be so readily accepted. First, because truth and power are construed as being independent of each other, "the intellectual as spokesman [sic] for conscience and consciousness locates himself [sic]... outside power and inside truth" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.130). Armed with the discursive privilege that having knowledge meant prophesizing a better future, intellectuals were to be trusted to create the elements that make up juridical (and other) discourse(s) which would exercise power over its subjects. The second condition for mass acceptance of this juridico-discursive power was that modern power mask itself effectively. While debates raged over rights discourse and other Enlightenment-inspired philosophical and legal subtleties about domination, cultural practices were being shaped by forms of power where substantial parts of those power forms were invisible. "Its success [was] proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms" (Foucault in Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.134).

In his article "The Subject and Power", Michel Foucault (1983) outlines his complicated understanding of power and how it is exercised. He clearly distinguishes between a relationship of violence and a relationship of power, demonstrating how violence is not a form of power. Violence acts directly upon a body or upon things to break or forcefully destroy. The only possible reaction to violence is passivity, its polar opposite. If there is resistance to the violence, the violent attacks simply increase to minimize the resistance. Jana Sawicki (1991, p.223) writes "when resistant forces are overcome, power relations collapse into force relations. The limits of power have been reached.

> In a relationship of power, there are two conditions which must be met:
>
> That "the other" (the one over whom power is exercised) be thoroughly recognized and maintained to the very end as a person who acts; and that, faced with a relationship of power, a whole field of responses, reactions, results, and possible inventions may open up (Foucault, 1983, p.220).

The exercise of power becomes a set of actions brought to bear upon another set of actions. In leading (or conducting in Foucault's words) a mode of behaviour is sought which opens up certain possibilities of action. Guiding that outcome, and putting it in a certain order, is an exercise of power.

Microphysics of Power

This new conceptualization views power as a positive force, where resistances and ruptures in the existing structures indicate the creation of new relationships of power. This idea brings power into the everyday practices of life and does not leave power enshrined in large macrostructures and institutions such as the State, the Bourgeosie, the Corporations, the Church, or the University. A microphysics of power considers power as capillary, operating at the minute levels of social life. These power relationships also support the disciplinary structures of modern life. Rather than perceive the domination of the masses and/or individuals (or minority groups and/or individuals), as a top down, power over issue, Foucault suggests that everyday practices reinforce and support the aims of the

State. He focuses on the power relations and the small practices of domination rather than on the subjects involved. There is a place for resistance and change to those power relations through micro-practices of power (Sawicki, 1991).

I am interested in this conception of power for several reasons. It has, and continues to be, a complex and difficult process for me to rethink and restructure how I understand power relations. I am a `great' product of these so-called juridico-discursive formations, and being immersed in second wave feminist theory has only implicated me further in the understanding of power as domination, as a zero sum game. I have analyzed how this group has "it", this group does not have "it" and how those one-way relationships are maintained. Shifting my perspective to regard power relationships as productive, and looking at how new opportunities are created within certain power relationships, is potentially a less depressing, a more hopeful way of understanding social systems and politicized action. Instead of feeling paralyzed in the face of indomitable macrostructures, some sense of agency can be theorized at an everyday level. Power is not a static, finite entity, but a productive force that creates many possibilities for action within various discourses.

Disciplinary Techniques

"Discourse is a description of function" and disciplinary technologies support those functions (Gore, 1992, p.2). Given that modern forms of power mask themselves effectively, various disciplinary techniques were developed and integrated from unexpected sites. Instead of originating with the State, institutions like prisons and schools are implicated by Foucault. It is not that the techniques developed within these institutions are directly comparable or are reflexes of these places, but they are "only the clearly articulated expressions of more generalized practices of discipline, surveillance and punishment" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.153).

With the rise of modern political power and the earliest implementation of juridico-discursive power in Western European cultures, the political/governmental state became an end in itself:

> Political rationality sought to increase the scope of power for its own sake by bringing the bodies of the state's subjects under tighter discipline...the object to be understood by administrative knowledge was the state...which required gathering information on the state's environment, population, resources, problems...the new political rationality of bio-power was therefore connected with the nascent empirical human sciences (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.137).

The gathering of information on the population took the form of a detailed understanding of how individuals could contribute to the strength of the state. This knowledge had the concurrent effect of the state having more influence on an individual's life (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983).

To start effectively influencing individuals' actions, modes of discipline and punishment had to appear to be suffused by the general population. These exercises of power were developed within penal institutions. Criminals had to become known in intimate detail so that the proper crime and subsequent punishment could be assessed and administered. This led to individuals being objectified and fixed in time and place. Foucault does a detailed analysis of Jeremy Bentham's 18th-century prison design for the Panopticon. This organization of individuals in space and the resulting deployment of surveillance techniques has been the impetus for Foucault's notion of panopticism or the panoptic eye/gaze.

The Panopticon was designed so that prisoners were put into individual cells (reminiscent of monastic cells) arranged in a circular formation around a high central observation tower. The cells were backlit, so that the prisoners could be seen clearly, without knowing whether they were being observed or not. Each cell had high side walls so there was no way to interact or be distracted with others. There was only the central tower in sight, and prisoners came to learn that they were being constantly surveilled and monitored: "Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, 1979, p.201). This disciplinary concept/technique is stunning in its ramifications for understanding how and why modern subjects act as they do. It is an amazing control device to have individuals collectively self-monitor their behaviours in determined fashions without any overt form of force or coercion.

One of the greatest innovations in education was the organization of serial space to allow independent work in elementary education. In the Classical age, students sat idle until the master was available to work with them. With new forms of time and individual space assignments, students could be supervised and all could work simultaneously. Gradually, the student became more productive in this learning machine, while they were also supervised, hierarchized and rewarded (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983).

This was achieved through the development of discipline, that which makes the "adjustments of people's abilities and resources, relationships of communication, and power relationships (to) form regulated systems" (Marshall, 1989, p.105). These regulated systems developed over time in educational practices through the use of strict timetables defined by closely monitored movements delineated by bells, whistles and other pre-determined signals, desks in rows in classrooms according to rank, self-enclosed spaces within larger units, reward and punishment systems, constant surveillance techniques both by self and other, and standardized curriculums. These practices form a body of knowledge with a system of social control to create the discipline of education (Marshall, 1989). These individualizing techniques all support the creation of docile bodies through disciplinary practices.

Docile Bodies

As political technologies developed they needed extensive and more detailed information on every aspect of each individual. To create productive and manageable citizens, this technology required that behaviours be molded into useful and disciplined ways. Not only were there external formations of juridico-discursive power which constrained individuals' actions, but there were technologies of the self that acted directly on the body. Foucault attempts to understand how the body becomes both subjected and useful:

> The body is directly involved in a political field... power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs (Foucault in Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.112).

This can be referred to as the genealogy of the modern individual as object (Dreyfuss and

Rabinow, 1983). The panoptic gaze and the regimented spatio-temporal configurations in which individuals were complicit, constituted technologies of the self.

Modern individuals were not only to be constructed as objects or docile bodies, they also had to be perceived as having some form of subjectivity within the modern political configuration. Psychology as a discipline plays a crucial role in compelling the modern subject to know oneself, to uncover one's "soul" (to use Foucault's term). As one gets to know oneself, one must attempt to rehabilitate the soul's deviance (May, 1993).

The confession became an important technology of information gathering, surveillance, and control while simultaneously giving the effect of voicing one's experience:

> Foucault is now seeking to show the rapport between these two types of technologies, to show how they are integrated into complex structures of domination... the interplay of techniques of discipline and less obvious technologies of the self (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.175).

Individuals became less concerned with other things, and more concerned with their interiority or inner self. "Foucault sees the confession... as a central component in the expanding technologies for the discipline and control of bodies, populations, and society itself" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.174). Energy the modern individual had was diverted to understanding their own subjectivity and not to disrupting those events outside of themselves.

Through detailed genealogical analyses, Foucault develops a complicated understanding of how power operates through discourse. Power is productive, and through micro-political practices, juridico-discursive power, and individualizing techniques to create docile bodies, the modern indiviudal is produced.

Specific Intellectuals

To identify how power formations and other disciplinary techniques construct outdoor education, I potentially occupy the privileged position of the intellectual who claims to know the truth while being outside power:

> Interpretative understanding can only be obtained by someone who shares the actor's involvement, but distances himself [sic] from it. This person must undertake the hard historical work of diagnosing and analyzing the history and organization of current cultural practices. The resulting interpretation is a pragmatically guided reading of the coherence of the practices of society. It does not claim to correspond either to the everyday meanings shared by the actors or, in any simple sense, to reveal the intrinsic meaning of the practices (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.124).

I fight a doubtful ambivalence throughout this whole project. As a participant and leader of AOE experiences, I have seen, as an actor, the wonderful things it can do for people. For example, individuals on AOE courses appear noticeably happier and may express their gratitude for having positive experiences in beautiful wilderness contexts. But these discursive formations also produce other effects concurrently, and it is those effects that I want to try and explore without completely negating the legitimated, visible practices. Foucault's framework has given me the tools to look at AOE in a different way:

> Rather than standing above or outside their society, "specific intellectuals" are immersed within it. They cite, analyze, and engage in struggles not in the name of those who are oppressed, but alongside them, in solidarity with them, in part because others' oppression is often inseparable from their own (May, 1993, p.7).

I believe a reading of how power and other disciplinary techniques are used unwittingly within outdoor education can be done, but that it will be only one of many potential and specific readings of outdoor education.

Outward Bound's educational techniques, leadership styles and related practices, have to be placed within the discourse of pedagogy and the larger discourses of social regulation. Within the discipline of education there are many competing ideas. My purpose here is to understand how Outward Bound (OB) has come to be the foremost outdoor school in the Western world, and how its program philosophy infuses some aspect of almost any outdoor education program (Ewert, 1989).

The "Emergence" of Outward Bound as Discipline

As mentioned in Chapter One, the first Outward Bound school in North America opened in 1962, but that is not the beginning of the North American OB history. In 1951, Josh Miner, a young, American, WWII-veteran went to Britain to work with and be trained by headmaster Kurt Hahn of the Gordonstoun boys boarding school. This training sabbatical for Miner had been arranged one year previously. Miner, as an American educator, had visited the Hahn school to report back to well-connected, American business people as to its potential for being an effective educational alternative.[2] This seemingly innocuous foray across the Atlantic can be identified as an emergence of Outward Bound in North America (Miner and Boldt, 1981).

Kurt Hahn developed his educational ideas to stand apart from the emphasis on academic achievement that was prevalent in elite British schools in the 1940s. His main theme was to be less concerned with the academic achievement of his students than with their attitudes, ambitions, and perceptions (Miner and Boldt, 1981). These ideas were nurtured by Hahn's upper class German upbringing, a passion for Platonic philosophy, his fortutitous patronage by German and British royalty and industrialists, and his direct resistance to Hitler's Nazism in 1930s Germany. He believed that students learned more through service, physical activity and adventure. An important underpinning of this philosophy was people learned through adventure rather than were trained for it.

It is interesting to read accounts of the Gordonstoun school that Hahn founded in Northern Scotland. Within this "alternative" educational system/philosophy, there are clear references to many disciplinary techniques to create docile bodies now identified by Foucault. Hahn had an "omnivorous curiosity about people" that allowed him to gather much detailed information about their backgrounds and skills that could contribute to his projects (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.19). "He has that amazing faculty for broad vision and the most minute detail! Astounding memory. Quite terrifying *except* that he always inspires anyone to do his very best" (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.25, emphasis in the original). Enveloped in a warm, respectful context, time with Hahn "had to be shared with his consuming desire to know about me. I was the subject of relentless questioning" (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.25). He counselled teachers and activity instructors to always extend the range of their reports on students, even if it extended into other jurisdictions. It could only help the student and their parents (Miner and Boldt, 1981). Hahn had worked hard as a young man to develop his own forms of discipline (practising long jump obsessively, overcoming a severe sunstroke case), and had learned that having detailed information about individuals could be used to engage people in certain attitudes and behaviours. This can be read as an example of Foucault's conception of productive power where individuals are in everyday situations constantly gathering information, or creating opportunities and challenges for themselves to find new places in discourse, however small.

Every boy at the Gordonstoun school had a role with a title attached to it (e.g., Helper of Guests, Helper of the House, Color Bearers, Guardian). This individualizing and specializing technique made every student productive and facilitated the functioning of the whole school. It ranked and partitioned each individual. This regime, a form of student government, hierarchical in nature, was called the Training Program. It was a self-disciplining program par excellence. Each boy's day was broken down into all of the small activities from morning to night:

> It was a checkoff list of each student's daily routine, starting with the morning run, cold shower, and room chores, and so on through doing of assignments, promptness for class, writing home, bedtime teeth brushing (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.21).

Each of these activities was supervised by a more senior student who meted out punishments if not carried out. After a certain amount of time had passed and the junior student had performed commendably, he would be deemed to be ready to be responsible for monitoring his own activities. If he faltered with his new freedom, he would return to being actively monitored.

But it was not that simple. The entire school population was implicated in this Training Program. Before a boy could advance, not only senior students, but teachers and administrators were held responsible if that boy failed. And if a child was experiencing major difficulties, it was the teacher who was put on trial for not noticing the problem, not the child. This structure had all supervising all, each becoming "a self-responsible member of the school community" (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.51). As Foucault (1979) understands discipline:

> it implies an uninterrupted, constant coercion, supervising the processes of the activity rather than its result and it is exercised according to a codification that partitions as closely as possible time, space, movement (p.137).

The panoptic gaze was implemented as a laudable enterprise for producing good citizens. For example, a "responsible" student asked why he did not cheat on his Training program, replied: "I used to, but I got tired of lying to myself" (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.21).

The Break was yet another individualizing technique developed at Gordonstoun. Each boy participated in six track and field events for four hours per week on a regular time schedule. They practised different events each day, judging their progress solely against their own past performances. The Foucaultian notion of exercise is apropos here:

> Exercise is that technique by which one imposes on the body tasks that are both repetitive and different, but always graduated...exercise makes possible a perpetual characterization of the indivdual in relation to this term (Foucault, 1979, p.161).

The overriding question at Gordonstoun was not where did the boy start, or where was he at, but "what is the boy doing with his endowment?" (Miner and Boldt, 1981, p.48). "There is not a single moment of life from which one cannot extract forces, providing one knows how to differentiate it and combine it with others" (Foucault, 1979, p.165).

Docile bodies have to be useful and intelligible. There was a strong service element to the Gordonstoun program. The students were responsible for coordinating and carrying out rescue missions through the Cliff Watchers, the Fire Service, and later the Mountain Rescue team. Training through adventure made them efficient and useful, belonging to an identifiable group and wearing school uniforms made them intelligible, and they contributed willingly to state functioning as exemplary citizens.

The Outward Bound philosophy is heavily indebted to the educational practices and philosophies developed by Kurt Hahn. The legacies of service to the state and individual improvement are two of the most obvious carryovers from the Hahnian boarding schools to the wilderness schools developed in North America.

Theorizing the individual in modern society is a difficult task, to which Foucault has many different but related approaches. One of his more useful distinctions for my analysis is conceptualizing the modern individual as both object (objectified) and subject (subjectified) in an interesting and complex dialectic. Many of his ideas can apply to the same practice or action and be interpreted in different ways. This is not to negate any interpretation, but to highlight what a contradictory and complicated space the modern individual finds her/himself within.

The Modern Individual as Object

Current outdoor adventure practices fall within many of the disciplining techniques that Foucault describes. This interpretation is an attempt to place those practices in another light, as a counterpoint to the progressive ideal of gaining and improving instrumental skills. I want to argue that these practices are double-edged (if not multi-edged) in the effects that they have. These technologies have become subtly entrenched and normalized in outdoor educational discourse. It is not just that the body becomes a passive, ordered automaton, but that it is actively producing its own objectification.

Outdoor education practices can be broken down to minute details that make for highly detailed and regimented practices. It is also a place where micro-practices of power can be identified. How do the small, innocuous details of outdoor education practices function within this particular perspective?

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault identifies three techniques for how bodies are placed in physical spaces. None of these are sufficient in themselves, nor completely representative of all situations, but these techniques are used often. The first technique is enclosure. It consists of a place closed in upon itself, heterogeneous to other regulated spaces, and is the protected place of disciplinary monotony.

The concept of enclosure can be read almost ironically in a wilderness setting. A mountain context could certainly be seen as heterogeneous to other spaces and enclosures. In fact, OB literature discusses how important being in free and open spaces is to its participants (Godfrey, 1980). I would suggest that for most novice backpackers (which logically predominate in outdoor education participant populations) it seems a very enclosed space.[3] On the surface, one could argue that in a mountain context there is no enclosure: there are no walls; no human made structures curtail; no roads predict direction; there are no tangible, concrete humanly created boundaries. But participants lack knowledge, comfort and familiarity with the terrain and living on it. This could make the mountain context very enclosing, restricting their spatial movements to following the group's routes, and/or staying within a fairly circumscribed area of each night's campsite so as not to be unintentionally separated from the group.

There is a certain amount of self-surveillance happening in such a scenario. The individual is expected to stay with the group, and in most likelihood views the group (or the leader of the group with her/his knowledge) as some form of physical security and so would likely desire to stay with the group. Using their well developed panoptic eye, the participant "chooses" to stay within a safe distance of the campsite, never risking getting lost or disoriented.

Partitioning is the movable, flexible aspect of the enclosure machinery. This second aspect of spatial organization is based on elementary location practices, which organize individuals in many ways and on many axes:

> One must eliminate the effects of imprecise distributions, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals, their diffuse circulation, their unusable or dangerous coagulation... (one must) establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits (Foucault, 1979, p.143).

Partitioning is done in extremely subtle ways as leaders (especially with adult populations) do not want to be perceived as dominating, or paternalistically ordering the group. Individuals are usually put into tent groups, based on some type of rationale, such as gender, previous relationships, cooking groups or behavioural tendencies (e.g., putting quieter individuals together, or dispersing unruly folk into separate groups). This grouping is all done for rational and functional reasons. It also organizes and partitions individuals into various sites.

There is a system of partitioning in how tent sites are chosen. There are rules and guidelines for choosing appropriate placement. On the surface, these guidelines are in place for practical reasons such as staying dry, avoiding wet places, and staying clear of potentially dangerous spots (e.g., under dead tree limbs, in avalanche/icefall runout zones, high risk lightning areas). But it also orders and circumscribes participants' freedom in this activity. Sometimes tents are placed together, often in a circular formation, to create a sense of imposed community. Often there can be a system of control of self-examining: Have I placed the tent in an appropriate spot? Have I followed all the rules appropriately?

Leaders can also control forms of communication by having tents close together, and creating a common, central place as the cooking area where people will congregate. Leaders can then know where individuals are at all times in camp. This is an important safety responsibility for outdoor leaders. Participants become constructed as being under surveillance and they soon start to help observe one another, and the panoptic gaze enters the outdoor group context. Outdoor groups may meet in circles to avoid the restrictive confines of rows, but the surveillance is shifted from leader to peers (Gore, 1992).

Other examples of partitioning have to do with trail etiquette and keeping the group together as they travel. With a population of young offenders instead of adults, individuals are consciously grouped by leaders so as to eliminate "their dangerous or unusable coagulations". Certain "instigators" must be placed with "natural leaders" in the group so as to diffuse potentially dangerous and disruptive factions.

As trips progress and certain groups excel in certain sanctioned skills, partitioning can become a subtle form of ranking, another disciplinary technique Foucault develops. There are spaces/ranks delineated for certain compartments and individuals may move in and out of those ranks. Some people will be more organized and efficient packing, others more sensitive to cold, hunger, pain, others more concerned with excelling physically, and still others who tend to be relational within the group. In an achievement- oriented society, and OB's philosophy of personal growth through experience, each of these compartments within an outdoor group setting becomes hierarchized corresponding to the sanctioned knowledges and abilities in that group. These invisible, but palpable, spaces vary, but often organize around physical prowess, willingness to risk physically and emotionally, and skillful group problem solving and support.

Leaders do not act independentally in their disciplining techniques. They are themselves self-surveilling. There are professional codes to be adhered to, safety and professional certifications to be maintained, protocols to be followed with rational foundations, and trip plans and expectations to be met. There are subtle and not so subtle consequences if these practices are not followed. They are "supervisors, perpetually supervised...(where) power and efficiency (are) joined in a system. Space and production are linked through an optics of surveillance" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.157). Even though outdoor leaders seem independent in the field, they are very closely circumscribed.

Time occupies an interesting place in an Outward Bound course. For participants, the course is such a break from their regular life grind that it takes on an appearance of "naturalness". You rise with the sun, sleep when it is dark, and organize activities around existing daylight patterns. A common instructional technique is to take watches away from participants. The illusion is then created that standard "clock" time is not valued.

This is yet another way to effectively mask how outdoor courses discipline the bodies of participants through time. Instructors have a curriculum to get through. They are providing a service that has been paid for, and are themselves paid workers. "Time measured and paid must also be a time without impurities or defects; a time of good quality, throughout which the body is constantly applied to its exercise (Foucault, 1979, p.151). Although the "bush clock" may be novel to participants, instructors are familiar with it and use it in highly regimented and formulaic ways. There is an adage among instructors I know (including myself) that during a well programmed course, participants do not realize how closely structured activities are:

> Discipline arranges a positive economy; it poses the principle of a theoretically ever-growing use of time: ...it is a question of extracting, from time, ever more available moments and, from each moment, ever more useful forces (Foucault, 1979, p.154).

Intricate pre-trip planning and post-trip evaluation are done by instructors to make courses evermore efficient and enriched. Outdoor leaders have become masters in governing, "structur[ing] the possible field of action for others" (Foucault, 1983, p.221).

There are also certain environmental time constraints. When doing any sort of summer mountaineering involving glacier or snow travel at high elevations, peak attempts must be started well before dawn so as to take advantage of hard, frozen snow conditions. If departing for the summit occurs too late in the day, the snow softens, making travel very difficult or dangerous. It is almost impossible to cover any ground when you fall up to your waist or chest in snow with each step, and snow bridges weaken with the warmth of the day and give way with body weight over deep crevasses.

Part of trip efficiency comes with teaching students particular physical skills that are necessary for carrying out outdoor adventure pursuits properly and safely. It is in these practices that the body is disciplined most directly. "In the correct use of the body, which makes possible the correct use of time, nothing must remain idle or useless: everything must be called upon to form the support of the act required" (Foucault, 1979, p.152). The skill is broken down into two distinct parts: those parts of the body to be used; and those parts of the object to be manipulated. Then the two sets of parts are correlated together according to a number of simple gestures. "Discipline defines each of the relations that the body must have with the object that it manipulates" (Foucault, 1979, p.153). Following the mountaineering theme, this is how precisely determined a safety skill, the self-arrest, has become.

The self-arrest is the technique used to stop your uncontrolled slide down a snow slope. The following are the instructions from a popular mountaineering text:

> The hands hold the axe in a solid grip, one hand in the self-arrest grasp with thumb under the adze and fingers over the pick, the other hand on the shaft just above the spike. The pick is pressed into the snow just above your shoulder so that the adze is near the angle formed by neck and shoulder. The shaft crosses your chest diagonally and is held close to the opposite hip. Gripping the shaft near the end prevents that hand as a pivot around which the spike can swing through to jab the thigh. The chest and shoulder are pressed strongly down on the ice axe shaft. The spine is arched slightly away from the snow. This arch is critical; it places the bulk of your weight on the axe head and on your toes or knees, the points that dig into the snow to force a stop. Pull up on the end of the shaft, which starts the arch and rolls weight toward the shoulder by the axe head. The knees are against the surface, helping slow the fall in soft snow. On harder surfaces they help stabilize body position. The legs are stiff and spread apart, toes digging in (Graydon, 1992, p.287).

The anatomical detailing is very clear. The skill is sequenced and broken down into elements regarding direction, duration, and aptitude. "Lastly, it fixes the canonical succession in which each of these correlations occupies a particular place" (Foucault, 1979, p.153). This body-object relation creates a system of discipline that is practised as an exercise within a mountaineering context. It is a required practice to climb snowy peaks:

> The regulation imposed by power is at the same time the law of construction of the operation. Thus disciplinary power appears to have the function not so much of deduction as of synthesis, not so much of exploitation of the product as of coercive link with the apparatus of production (Foucault, 1979, p.153).

The culmination of all these small disciplinary techniques make an outdoor group a functioning machine. They move over mountainous terrain roped together, their distribution clearly marked at every 15 feet. They move at appropriate times of the day within certain time and program configurations, and they operate with safety practices exercised and adhered to. This is a "machine whose effect will be maximized by the concerted articulation of the elementary parts of which it is composed" (Foucault, 1979, p.164). A very important aspect to enabling this "machine" to function, is that the persons who comprise the "machine" perceive themselves as viable, individual subjects.

The Modern Individual as Subject

Foucault sees the modern individual as subject in terms very much implicated by the discourse of psychology. As the individual is compelled to find out more about their `real' self, they rely more heavily on `experts' to help interprete who they are.

On Outward Bound programs, disparate individuals come together in outdoor settings to live and travel. Sharing of feelings is encouraged and seen as healthy. Personal growth and empowerment are cornerstones for most of these programs. This growth/development is processed by talking about it, or confessing. Confessing, as a technology of the self, resonates strongly in Outward Bound contexts, especially those that involve risk or interpersonal development.

In debriefing an experience, an outdoor facilitator is attempting to draw out the feelings, interpretations and understandings that participants had. The unwritten, tacit agreement in these situations is that the experience will be assessed, and that "learnings" will be gleaned from which individually and as a group, improvements can be made. Of course, a "skilled" facilitator will draw out the positive aspects of the occurrence under scrutiny. But almost always there is a premise that improvements or new understandings should be synthesized. This implies that something wasn't quite right, or optimally efficient in the first place.

A facilitator will make it appear that members of the group come to their own realizations about their own and the group's interactions. Confession, or speaking about how one felt, acted, or wanted to be, is an integral and required act in this thing called debriefing. There is a place constructed for the speaker within the debriefing circle, with an unspoken expectation that to improve, one must divulge and/or reveal certain things about themselves. "The modern subject is not mute; [s/]he must talk" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.175).

This is all predicated on the ingrained and accepted assumption that improvement is an important and worthy goal. The effect of this practice is to entrench and support confession as a technology of the self, and to reiterate the importance of the discipline of group cohesion and harmony in the name of efficiency, fulfillment and happiness:

> The cultural desire to know the truth about oneself prompts the telling of truth; in confession after confession to oneself and to others, this mise en discours has placed the individual in a network of relations of power with those who claim to be able to extract the truth of these confessions through their possession of the keys to interpretation (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.174).

The outdoor leader not only disciplines the body as object, but holds the interpretative keys to being a subject. As modern discourses cling to the repressive hypothesis, individuals believe that since truth is opposed to power, telling and re-telling the truth about ourselves will lead us toward freedom. The subject, in this case the OB participant, still has to verify the truth of this expert interpretation. "Individuality, discourse, truth and coercion were given a common localization" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.180). It is this attempt by OB-type programs to enhance and mold subjectivity that will be the focus of Chapter Three. How a modern disciplined subject can realize the `truth' of any interpretation is seeming more and more dubious to me the more I read and try to understand Foucault.

Potentially, resistance could be exercised by a modern individual who is both object and subject. However, in opposing an AOE `norm', these resistive "acts" could also be interpreted in other ways. For instance, a female leader who found the practices of her male co-leader sexist in his patronizing and domineering manner, could create spaces for herself to deal with this behaviour by subverting his actions through sarcastic humour. How that is received is always contextual and open to interpretation. She could be seen as acting politically in a feminist context. She could also be seen as simply witty and cunning. She could also meet with hostile reactions. She can be seen as resisting the `ordering' that prescribes certain modes of femininity and patriarchal dominance. She could help interpret herself as an acting feminist subject. These are only some of the specific interpretations of resistance and disruption that can occur through a micro-physics of power.

This is only a very small and partial reading of the effects of Outward Bound and other outdoor adventure practices. Nancy Fraser (1989) critiques Foucault for invoking terms such as resistance without having a normative framework against which to evaluate that resistance. Todd May (1993) claims that Foucault's genealogy has no epistemic justification and falls into the realm of relativism and perspectivism. Clearly, Foucault is by no means "right" or infallible.

But, Foucault's work has been helpful to me to unpack some of the naturalized practices of AOE and understand them in a new analytic light. My distaste for the evangelicism of certain OB accounts is sprinkled throughout. Whenever Foucault heard "talk of meaning and value, of virtue and goodness, he look(ed) for strategies of domination" (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.109). It is an important start to reconsider some of these "liberatory" or "alternative" discourses to see what other things they might be doing.

The theorizing about outdoor education environments being completely unique social contexts, where individuals can self-actualize outside of urban and other social pressures, seems hollow to me in view of Foucault's ideas. "Their failure to fulfill their promises does not discredit them; in fact, the failure itself provides the argument they use for further expansion (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.182). The next chapter will consider subjectivity, psychology's role in its construction, and some of its effects on individuals. Adventure outdoor education falls into the trap of justifying and expanding its programs through a passionate reliance on psychology's human development models. A detailed reading of the book, Islands of Healing: A Guide to Adventure Based Counselling, is used to demonstrate the effects of this reliance on a self-actualizing, coherent, rational subject.

Notes

1. As Dreyfuss and Rabinow (1983, p.104) are at pains to point out, "there is no pre- and post-archaeology or geneology in Foucault". The emphasis that Foucault placed on each of these approaches changes throughout his career, but they both mutually inform and support the other. But May (1993) points out there are three objections to Foucault's archeological method: there is a distinction between the discursive (what is said) and the non-discursive (the analysis of rules and formation of discourses); it does not distinguish enough between the discursive and non-discursive to explain how they can be heteronomous and related; and by claiming that the any historical moment is determinative of its own historical condition, falls into an unresolved form of historical relativism.

2. There is a whole other critical, historical project to be written about the corporate structure and development of Outward Bound USA.

3. In the book, Outward Bound: Schools of the Possible, Robert Godfrey records his experiences at the seven Outward Bound schools in the United States. Everyone of the disciplinary techniques I describe to generate docile bodies can be read onto almost any trip type he discusses in his book. As an outdoor educator, I have employed many, if not almost all of the program activities and leadership styles he discusses. I am not suggesting that OB experiences are all identical, but I think that there are many commonalities. I will only use a few standard examples of outdoor trips to support my arguments, but there would be a myriad of other illuminating situations. I choose to use the mountain context because it is pertinent to my geographical location. My use of course is roughly following a "standard"-type OB course as described in Chapter One.

Chapter Three

ADVENTURE BASED COUNSELLING: SUBJECTIVITY AND SUBJECTIFICATION

In this chapter I explore initially how psychology takes up a theoretical understanding of the subject. Having a clearly articulated critique and understanding of "psychology's subject" and how it is constructed/disciplined is necessary for the critical reading of adventure based counselling which I undertake in this chapter. Adventure based counselling (ABC) is dependent upon psychological theory to justify its existence and perpetuation (primarily for program funding purposes and gaining/ maintaining academic credibility). The program focus of improving "self-concept" supports the tenets and social effects that are continually reproduced by practices motivated to reinforce and perpetuate mainstream psychological knowledge. The general discipline of psychology has become a body of knowledge, with attendant professional practices deriving from those theories, that is historically constructed and socially situated. It is a product of socio-historical forces and it is shaped by and has helped shape contemporary social relations.

I have been frustrated and baffled by many of the implicit assumptions that I have encountered within most psychological research literature (mainstream and feminist) and associated programs (e.g., ABC). The claims to truth that psychological discourse has come to naturalize as "common sense" are debilitating and damaging in certain instances. Individuals who do not or choose not to fit into neat psychological categories and/or behave in socially sanctioned ways find themselves pathologized (overtly and covertly) in the psychological regulation of modern subjects. I have found this discourse very difficult to unpack and critique without deconstructing it back to its epistemological assumptions.

In this chapter I attempt to place this discourse within the politicized realm of social relations as a product of historical forces and not as some unshakeable truth unto itself, divorced from the lived realities of its subjects.

I want to trace the "historical conditions which permitted the emergence of psychology's subject" (Henriques *et al*, 1984, p.92). Calling into question the "naturalness" of the subject radically disrupts the assumptions of any program (e.g., ABC) that uses psychological theory as its basis and rationale for existence. It is important to outline clearly how psychology's subject is not a pregiven essence to be discovered and rehabilitated. By demonstrating its historical contingencies, resistance and alternatives to the norm are made possible by those who are negatively inscribed within that discourse. Not exclusively, but very often, this list would include women, homosexual peoples, and "low-achievers" among others. The construction of knowledge contributes to and is influenced by the processes within the social domain.

I discuss the emergence of psychology's subject through two main theoretical themes. First, I trace historically how the subject of psychology has come to be individualized, and constructed as one-half of a theoretically pervasive individual-society dualism. The myth of the natural, transparent subject is exposed. I look to strands of feminist psychology for a better theorized version of subjectivity grounded within social relations as a potential alternative to a presumed androcentric, unitary subject.

Secondly, I discuss feminist critiques of psychology and their effects. The discourse about the psychology of women, and even of more explicitly feminist psychology, still relies on a theoretical notion of the feminine subject in individualistic terms. Within feminist psychological discourse, not only is the individual/society binary maintained, but the dichotomy of male/female (masculine/feminine) is implicitly theorized as natural and prediscursive to culture. This is discussed in light of feminist psychology's adherence to an empiricist tradition with a positivist epistemology. Finally, I discuss how adventure based counselling (ABC) as outlined in the book Islands of Healing: A Guide to Adventure Based Counselling contributes to and is supported by the theoretical themes discussed in the chapter.

The Emergence of Psychology's Subject

Knowledge and/or truth are not outside of discourse, they are integral components of its creation and entrenchment. The Enlightenment quest for an ideal truth to be "discovered" in its full essence has implicated psychology in constructing its discourses and practices for the unitary and rational individual (Gavey, 1989). By demonstrating the historical contingency of this category (unitary, rational individual), one can deconstruct the assumption of the natural presumption of truth inherent in this category:

> Individuality is neither the real atomistic basis of society nor an ideological illusion of liberal economics, but an effective artifact of a very long and complicated historical process (Foucault in Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983, p.120).

One must realize that the statements of any discourse are the "strategic products of calculations inscribed in a number of other discourses and which have invisible effects on it" (Venn, 1984, p.125). There is nothing clear and simple about how statements within discourse impact other discourses. There is no one-to-one, cause and effect relationship. Therefore, this is only one among many competing accounts.

The notion of a unitary rational subject first emerges in the seventeenth century. It is the combination of two main elements:

> the subject of science and reason born with modern science (and the new social order that replaces feudalism) and the abstract legal subject, the subject of general rights and of possessive individualism (Venn, 1984, p.133).

The first of these two elements is easily seen in Descartes credo, "I think, therefore I am". The second of these is played out in liberal humanistic theory whereby the subject is equalized and generalized according to the law, contractual obligations, and property. It is very specifically confined to biological notions about the ability to make rational decisions, clearly linking the two elements of legal rights and reasoning with biologically determined rational capabilities. Children, women, blacks and the propertyless are considered less rational naturally (in their essences) than white men, and therefore are considered incapable of making the reasoned decisions necessary to be afforded subject status (Venn, 1984).

The 17th century assumptions (which still have great contemporary salience) about who is rational enough to be considered a subject (i.e., white, propertied males), indicate that the notions of the individual were used for certain economic and administrative calculations to inscribe and organize individuals in specific, disciplined manners (Venn, 1984). What being rational means is highly circumscribed and controlled, enabling only certain individuals in particular strategic groups to be given subject status. Therefore rationality, and subjectivity based in those terms, are historically specific constructs.

Psychology produced a powerful and enduring notion from this epistemological foundation:

> It produces the identity between the normal subject of individualism and that of rationality, and locates that identity inside the subject. Thus it naturalizes that notion of rationality and normality (Venn, 1984, p.133).

This conception of the individual found its place with the rise of science in the seventeenth century. This new regime of truth supported and created the emphasis on mathematical reasoning, the antithetical stance towards the Church and facilitated the transition whereby rational necessity supplanted ideas of physical causality and transparent representation. The new natural, rational man served these discourses well as rationality and logic became the basis for the logocentric subject (Venn, 1984).

The liberal doctrines of Hobbes and Locke resulted in practices based on the ideologies of "the greatest good for the greatest number" and possessive individualism. Capitalist social relations, industrialization, and ideas about understanding bodies as machines flourished to inform the political landscape and inscribe those meanings on bodies and individuals. With the construct of "homo rationalis" firmly implanted in the discourse, any behaviour that deviated from the norm of the social good, was to be construed as errors in the mind induced by the senses. What constituted the "social good" was also a historically specific construct, contingent upon the dominant social relations of the time.

One final link must be made in this historical account to make it intelligible. Within Cartesian thought, the concept of cogito, the mind guaranteeing its own rationality, was foundational. The basis or *a priori* assumption of this cogito was left to divine creation. By the middle of the nineteenth century the vestiges of theological dependency were finally superseded by more specific scientific theories. Darwin, with his theories of natural evolution, linked studying the mind as a natural, scientific object as complementary to the emergent medical discourses that were studying the functioning of the body, and the natural sciences that were studying the functioning of the natural world (Venn, 1984).

This theoretical shift reduces the "mind to the same material status as the rest of the body". It becomes integrated within the model of mind as "logical machine and information processor" (Venn, 1984, p.135). The concept of the individual here does not change. It is the foundation of how the individual comes to be. The human subject is biologized with this displacement of religious guarantees of truth, to a "naturalized" state of being. These processes, being based in nature, could now be subjected to the rigors of scientific explanation, and being based in a biological essence, will be seen as immutable and unable to change (Hollway, 1984; Venn, 1984).

Psychology, as the science of the mind, sets out to study the individual as the "object of science". This method of inquiry involves a process of differentiation or deviation from a "norm", which the discipline of psychology has continuously calibrated for the past century. Individuals are placed according to the degree they err from the norm. "Psychological explanation attempts to account for the deviations; it does not address the question of the normality of the norm" (Venn, 1984, p.131). The norm is considered to be unproblematic in mainstream psychology, and is based on this fictitious unitary subject based in biology. It is difference from that norm that psychology measures, and how psychologists attempt to control those deviations that helps to perpetuate the discipline.

The Discipline of Psychology

Psychology vigilantly attempts to maintain an internal coherence. Because of its reliance on a biological notion of the individual and its dependence on scientific method, energy is put towards perpetuating "better" versions of psychological knowledge. Questioning the scientific process does not occur because that process is inherent in the positivist tradition. By definition "science is the rational process of knowledge" (Venn, 1984, p.126). As Celia Kitzinger (1990, p.68) points out: "Psychology as an institution is not deeply concerned about which of a rather limited range of possible theories `wins'... what matters is that the game should go on". Psychology is notorious for its lack of self-reflexivity in its knowledge production practices and is blind to considering its position within social relations outside of its own disciplinary boundaries (Pilgrim, 1990; Henriques *et al*, 1984). I argue later that even feminist challenges to the patriarchal nature of psychological research and practice are not adequate because those challenges still operate within many of the unexamined theoretical constraints in which traditional psychology has constructed itself.

The general insularity of psychology has been challenged in the last twenty years. Starting with work by Rom Harre, Nigel Armistead and others in the early 1970s, psychology has been taken to task for being too focused on the individual and not positioned within the socio-political realm (Henriques *et al*, 1984). I return to the ideas of Michel Foucault for the most convincing accounts of this critical literature. His work demonstrates how psychology contributes to the disciplining of modern subjectivity and how it is inextricably linked to contemporary social functioning.

As outlined in Chapter 2, Foucault discusses how modern institutions and disciplines contribute to the functioning of modern subjects. He suggests that the constructedness of "common sense" assumptions should be outlined. Genealogy gets at what has been left out in history, those events at the margins that have informed many modern disciplines and institutions. Exposing the constructedness of psychology's subject is an application of Foucault's techniques.

Modern institutions regulate and administer the individual through various disciplinary techniques. Through amassing detailed and copious information on the subject, social practices changed to meet the needs of the individual *and* concomitantly, the operation and facilitation of the state. Modern individuals are not "under the thumb" of the state directly. They are presented with various subject positions to take up, resist, or modify. For the modern world to function in the manner that it does, efficient and regulated forms of organization had to be developed and internalized by individuals. Foucault's analyses of the disciplines of education, punishment, psychology and sexuality would be examples of this (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983).

The application and popular internalization of psychological norms and language supported and helped create certain forms of normative behaviour. This is the productive aspect of the psychological discipline. The effects of modern practices are multi-faceted and there can be more than one meaning or interpretation attached to the same event or practice. Not all psychological knowledge is "wrong" or "oppressive". It is how it is used that is always open to interpretation about the potential for its uses or abuses.

What is exciting for me about Foucault's work is that he provides an explanation for the development of the modern state (in which psychology is implicated), without falling into the trap of either individualizing a liberal agent or making the case for a conspiratorial society. As a reminder from Chapter 2, subjects, although subjected, are also productive. Power is theorized as being positive and creating opportunities in conjunction with its repressive and restraining aspects. Foucault describes a micro-physics of power, where power operates in the everyday social relations of historically constituted individuals. It is from this point that a different theorizing of subjectivity can start, with the potential for political agency embedded in social relations to be recognized (Dreyfuss and Rabinow, 1983).

The Individual/ Society Dualism

Western thought is constructed and reliant on dualisms (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1990b). One such constraining dualism in psychology's rendering of subjectivity is that of the individual and society. This dualism has hampered theorists who have attempted to reframe psychological theory to be non-reductionist. Typically, attempts have been made to offset the heavy (sole) emphasis on the individual by trying to theorize a social component onto an individualistic account (Henriques *et al*, 1984).

This theoretical stance still leaves the two poles of the dualism untouched and unproblematized. In attempts to make psychological accounts "more social", an `a priori' individual is always presumed and left untheorized. This framework still relies on the unitary, pre-given individual as the privileged half of the binary. Although the two aspects of society and individual interact, they are still conceptualized as distinct, independent notions. The basic assumption of internalizing socialized norms relies on this binary framework. There is a solitary unit which is imbued with "social" knowledge. There is no attempt to understand or evaluate the content of the social or of the individual within that relation, and how each of these poles is historically constituted.

The individual, as historically constructed in psychological theory, becomes an information processor and takes whatever raw materials the "society" gives it and internalizes them as part of its development. All of this removes the individual from its complex social matrix and unproblematically feeds social information in, to be "processed", "accommodated" and/or "assimilated" into a cognitive mechanism. This presumes that the social is a pregiven and known entity and that the individual (based in biology) is a passive recipient of received wisdom. As long as "psychology brackets content into the domain of the social and defines it as outside the boundaries of its theories" (Henriques *et al*, 1984, p.20), it will not be able to adequately theorize a radically politicized subjectivity:

> Because certain norms have become so much part of our common-sense view of reality, we are able to forget that they are the result of a production: that they have become naturalized as indisputably biological or social. The dualism is the theoretical result of that forgetting (Henriques *et al*, 1984, p.22).

Generally psychology's focus has been on the individual, with social psychology leading the way to try and account for some aspects of the influences of the social realm on the individual. Unfortunately, psychology's use of the "social" has been under-theorized.

Certain theorists (outside of psychology) attempted to get out from under the determinism of liberal humanism's focus on the individual and developed far reaching analyses of social relations. Structuralism, which is most commonly associated with the work of Louis Althusser, professed that the subject was constituted by social processes. By reworking Marxist theory, Althusser attempted to get around the problem of class reductionism. Though his notions of interpellation[1] and the subject being "always already social" are helpful in decentering the individual as a pre-given entity, Althusser's theory still relies on a prediscursive entity that is to be shaped by social processes. The structuralism of Althusser is also ultimately economically determined, with the "economy" being an independent "untheorized real". Although attempting to theorize the social more adequately, Althusser's configuration eventually finds itself in the blind alley created by the individual/society binary. How is the subject constitutive and agentic in this framework? This time the social is privileged rather than the individual (Henriques *et al*, 1984).

Gender and Psychological Discourse

Psychological theories of gender have maintained this dualism with the result being that they have been unable to escape the constraints that the individual-society dualism creates around theorizing any sort of "female" subjectivity. Even a politicized, feminist subjectivity (that which would acknowledge and resist the traditional masculinist, patriarchal renderings of subjectivity) fails to theorize outside of the binary. Psychological theorizing around gender has predominately been focused on gender differences between individuals (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1990b). This discourse immediately assumes a fixed notion of the individual from which differences are measured. Because the traditional mythic psychological subject is gendered male, the female "differences" are construed as the "other", unprivileged, non-dominant halves of the binaries that studying difference implies.

Embedded in the assumptions of psychology's epistemological tradition, differences can be found within and between individuals given that methods adhere to appropriate scientific methods and measurements. Rhoda Unger (1990) points out that there are inconsistencies within that "scientized" discourse itself. Sex, like race, is set up as a dualism, rather than on a continuum as are other psychological variables (although it could be argued that a continuum implies a dualism nonetheless). Psychology has never developed clear criteria to evaluate how or what constitutes a psychological category. This of course belies its historical and discursive production which the discipline denies.

As the psychology of women discourse expanded, psychologists started to differentiate between sex differences and gender differences. Sex was used for those variables that were directly based in biology. Gender referred to those aspects of males and females that had not been linked to biological causality (Unger, 1990). This formulation is extremely problematic. It is very difficult to ascertain accurately whether social or biological (i.e., individual) influences are affecting behaviours. This configuration does not allow any space for the complex and constant relations in which individuals, however gendered, find themselves.

Feminist psychologists have tended to study gender more than sex. "Sex-related traits were seen as stable and coherent- as part of the essential nature of the person" (Unger, 1990, p.109). This framework posits women as destined by biology to remain in the many subordinate positions they inhabit. Feminist psychologists started to use gender to refer to those differences generated from the social context. A distinction based on the individual/society (or sex/gender) dualism was made. Attaching terms (sex/gender) to the two poles of the dualism does not adequately theorize what the two terms implicate in each other:

> Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pregiven sex; gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which "sexed nature" or "a natural sex" is produced and established as prediscursive, prior to culture, a politically neutral surface *on which* culture acts (Butler, 1990, p.7, emphasis in the original).

The use of sex and gender is still a complicated and contested impasse in much feminist and psychological literature. Unger (1990) points out that there is a paradigm shift occurring in feminist psychology. Rather than concentrating on the behaviour of the sexes, how the sexes are perceived should be pursued. Masculinity and feminity discourses construct various subject positions for individuals to choose in their construction of social realities.

A large amount of empirical data on gender differences has been produced in the last 20 years (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1990a). This involves gathering information on traits, roles, personality theories, and other traditional psychological categories. Psychology's obsessions with experimental control can be articulated as:

> Explicit distance separating researcher from researched; conversion of subjects into objects; "universal laws" that render race/ethnicity, gender, and social class to be "noise"; a romance with sterile environments called laboratories in which human behaviour can be perverted and then studied as if "natural and "uncontaminated"; a commitment to generalizability that turns "real" social contexts into intrusions on science; and a fetish with imposed categories, comparisons, hierarchies, and stages (Fine and Gordon, 1992, p.2).

One feminist tactic has been to criticize this empirical method for its androcentric bias. The claim is that by exposing sexism in the research process (including all stages from identifying and defining problems, formulating hypotheses, research design and the collection and interpretation of data), the research ultimately becomes less biased and therefore better science. This is called feminist empiricism (Harding, 1990). "A great deal of feminist social psychology has been devoted to pointing out the pseudoscientific nature of allegedly objective research saturated with male perspectives and values" (Kitzinger, 1990, p.63). An example of this in feminist psychology is the practice of statistical meta-analyses to filter out and re-analyze the gender-bias of older research findings (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1990b). I do not view this project as sufficient because it leaves intact and untouched the positivist epistemological stance. There is no space for theorizing and understanding a subject outside the confines of a presumed unitary, singular entity. The possibilities for a contradictory, plural subjectivity within the complicated social webs are not possible within a feminist empiricism.

Part of the discourse on differences has been to privilege women's experience. This is best exemplified in the work of Carol Gilligan (1982) where she asserts that female moral development occurs through a caring ethic, rather than an ethics of justice. Her research affirms and privileges this female experience. Other feminist psycho-dynamic theories posit universal and enduring female differences applied to core self-structure, identity, and relational capacities. This type of research has been extended into theorizing about cognitive differences based on gendered psychic structures. Gendered moral reasoning and the acquisition and organization of knowledge are particular focuses of this research (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 1990b; Lott, 1990).

These theories have two dangerous aspects. The first is the implied universalism that reduces to a biological imperative inherently found in the immutable category "woman". The privileging of women's experience is considered transparent and unique (Gavey, 1989). This does not problematize the permutations and combinations of constructed gender identities with other social relations. These social relations are organized on axes such as the discursive categories of race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, able-bodiedness and so on. How gender relations intersect with, combine with, and constitute other social relations, and in turn, how those social relations help to constitute gender relations is not theoretically grounded.

The second danger is articulated by Wendy Hollway (1991):

> The only difference between feminist psychology's use of femininity and masculinity and the old patriarchal psychology of sex differences is that feminist psychology has re-evaluated femininity as superior. This is not enough to make a political difference (p.30).

An androcentric worldview is replaced with a gynocentric one, ultimately flipping the power structure and not fundamentally analyzing the relations that are produced within it.

There has been a small amount of research on gender similarities. The best example is the category of psychological androgyny. Sandra Bem developed a Sex Role Inventory in an attempt to show that masculine and feminine traits are held to some degree by all individuals. Wetherell (1986) notes that this echoes the Jungian concepts of anima and animus as inherent in all human psyches. Feminist critics of Bem's problematic research, which is not widely cited anymore, pointed out two conceptual and political inadequacies/ dangers. As is implicit in its binary construction, one half of the dualism is privileged. Thus, androgyny was soon equated with the masculine as the privileged behavioural manifestation. Second, posing masculinity and femininity as complementary opposites, and inherently equal, masks the power relations between these two discourses. These problems very effectively depoliticizes any kind of feminist impact this type of theorizing may have (Wetherell, 1986; Hare-Mustin and Marecek 1990b).

Psychology of women literature is large and has demonstrated positive and negative aspects of femininity. I have not found any convincing feminist psychological re-theorizing of how the "social" is not simply grafted onto the "individual". It is still implicitly stuck in the theoretical conundrum of dualisms (individual/ society, sex/gender, masculinity/femininity). A theoretical understanding of subjectivity that can account for the complexity of social relations (of which gender relations is only one aspect) must get out of the binary framework. Some feminist accounts address how gender is constituted in social relations but they do not explicitly theorize how the construction of subjectivity actively integrates and is integrated by discursive social relations and language (Hollway, 1984; Wilkinson, 1986; Unger, 1990; Fine and Gordon, 1992). I will expand on this in Chapter 4. I now turn to the implications of this theoretical overview and how adventure based counselling (ABC) and its practices clearly demonstrate many of the effects I have been discussing.

Adventure Based Counselling and Psychological Regulation

Throughout their book Islands of Healing, Schoel *et al* consistently make claims and statements which support and perpetuate many of the ideas presented thus far. The book gives a skeletal framework of the history of Project Adventure and briefly overviews the eclectic theoretical foundations of adventure based counselling. The remainder of the book discusses the formulas and techniques for implementing the ABC process. Various chapters go through the foundations of programming, sequencing strategic activities, and the rationale and practices behind the briefing, leading, debriefing cycle upon which adventure based counselling relies. The book finishes with various programs that have applied the ABC philosophy. The individual of an ABC (adventure based counselling) program, that mythic subject, is presumed throughout the text to be able to achieve an ultimate goal in self-efficacy and personal development. This is done by improving self-concept.

The theoretical foundation of ABC relies on work done by psychological theorists such as Carl Rogers, Kurt Lewin, and William Fitts (author of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, TSCS). There is an adherence to many traditional psychological theories and their scientific methods. ABC practitioners evaluate the program using results from the TSCS to demonstrate that their program practices do improve self-concept. The ABC program is broken into key elements which are "attribute[s] of the program which [are] needed in program designs in order to replicate the original evaluation results" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.12).

Echoing the need for scientific process, ABC places itself in the biologized, psychological realm, through invoking essentialist, immutable reasons for behaviour. In the text, it is claimed that a lack of norepinephrine (a neurotransmitter chemical) causes depression in clients (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.18). ABC is fully implicated in scientific psychological discourse.

Some of the assumed, naturalized `givens' of psychology are invoked in the Foreword of the Schoel book. "We have known for a long time that challenge and risk, in a supportive environment which values effort, create an opportunity for humans to discover and develop their potentialities" (p.vi). The individual is a presumed independent (albeit supported) entity that is waiting to be unfolded and developed. This conception neatly fits into the traditional subject category, being not only essential in its discoverable core but a willing participant in an achievement motivated, North American society that values effort. The self-sufficient liberal doctrine isolates and decontextualizes the individual in its effort to discover its potentialities.

Another example of the reliance on the traditional conception of the individual is: "The client will for a time try on different clothing. The different person that comes alive (whether a flicker or a flame) is the client's potential, reflecting hidden desires and capabilities" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.53). Here the essential core subject can find itself, uncovering latent human properties. This passage implicitly strips the subject of any agency. The use of the word reflect, rather than change, resist, or create, means that the individual is only capable of becoming the `subject' which has been prediscursively determined.

Throughout the text, the focus of ABC is to individualize, pathologize and then manipulate subjects into certain sanctioned behaviours. Everything is geared to the individual being responsible for her/his own actions, and there is an expectation that behaviours deemed less than fully functional (that is contributing to the prevalent dominant social values as embodied through group norms) will be changed or an effort will be demonstrated towards changing their conduct. Many of these behaviours are typical practices that faciliate everyday social interactions. They also regulate and codify certain modern ways of disciplined functioning, including striving to become that fully unified subject upon which psychological theory is hinged.

The "intake" procedure is a surveillance technique par excellence. It is defined as: "The initial interview with a prospective Adventure group participant. The process implies transmitting information about the group, and gathering information about the participant" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.34). This process contributes to amassing detailed information about the participant so they can be molded "appropriately". It also supports the notion that ABC counsellors can "know" about their charges.

The ABC process attempts to make everything `known' and up front right from the start. There is an attempt for clients to be fully informed:

> Clarity at the beginning sets the stage for ongoing goal monitoring. It's hard to monitor something that is fuzzy, undefined, confusing, and not agreed to... Resistance, which is a natural antecedent of familiarity (note the family analogy), will tend to not be as severe as it will become after the group is in operation. And it is the changing that that we are about (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.106).

The need to create a subject that is goal-defined, monitorable and controllable is what ABC strives to mould. There is no room for unpredictability or the unknown, and if resistance is encountered it is actively interpreted as requiring change or needing to be "fixed". According to Schoel *et al* (1988, p.99), participants "will constantly test (limits), pushing against authority, order, and discipline...Those who test the most tend to be those whose gear is loose. They are asking for help in tightening it up". The presumptuous paternalism aside, this is a classic example of how ABC leaders are shown how to regulate and control behaviour, and implicitly, social values.

Many of the supposed disruptive and/or transgressive behaviours described in Islands of Healing can be given other interpretations, including coping behaviours carried over from other lives and realities. Given feminist, anti-racist and/or other alternative readings, these "problem" behaviours can be `read' as agentic coping mechanisms that could be seen as politicized and/or appropriate resistances, given certain contexts and audiences. These alternative readings are never given space within the book. In fact, resistance is actively controlled and suppressed.

Psychological norms are positively reproduced through ABC practices. Examples of productive power and its use are sprinkled throughout Islands of Healing. The concomitant effort to mask negative power is evident:

> Experienced leaders learn to conceal their ultimate authority through exhaustive preparation...In practice the group controls many aspects of the experience, because a major part of its reason for being is learning to make responsible choices. But the final authority, the bottom line is always the leader (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.89).

The illusion of choice is created in the ABC context by carefully and subtly organizing the individual's behaviour. The Full Value Contract is an agreement between client and counsellor as to what goals the client will work on, and is the agreement that the client will fully embrace the group credo to not "devalue or discount themselves or other group members" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.16). Individuals' options are extremely circumscribed, but because they do exercise some choice within a very limited context of options, they are given the illusion of some productive agency:

> Ongoing goal-monitoring involves continuous negotiation and the formation of new goals. This is a dynamic process, based on the presupposition that strength begets strength... This is groundwork for new goals. [The] repetition of the goal-setting process helps it become a habit. As the habit becomes ingrained, the carry-over through spiralling is a natural outcome (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.107).

The focus is on individuals to change and to become better through ordering their lives on a very inwardly-focussed, singular basis. The client is taught a productive process which continues to reinforce compliant social behaviours. This training and reinforcement facilitate the re/production of disciplined and docile bodies. The authoritarian, repressive force is effectively masked in the background.

There is a focus on group members regulating themselves throughout the book. Individuals are expected to confront other members when behaviours exhibited are transgressive of contract goals. Group members are expected to be supportive of one another right from the `intake' process. The panoptic gaze is subtly pervasive in this whole arrangement as group members start to police not only the group credo, but each others' individual goals:

> Common issues can be artfully brought to the surface and dealt with within the context of common goal setting. For example, a group comprised of academically unsuccessful students made success in their classes a prerequisite for participation in the planned expedition. They began to monitor each other's class work. Only those who earned the trip were able to go. Those who went became the elite, the standard of excellence (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.53).

The hierarchical nature of reward, the values that are rewarded (individual work, academic elitism) and the coercive peer pressure are in complete accordance with modern, capitalist society. There seems to be little space for an alternative type of interpretation. There is no room for a social context, history, or subjectivity that may involve factors that make it impossible for the student to meet the standard. The "failures" are explicitly "othered".

Because the subject is presumed to be transparent, unitary and fully understandable, ABC can make sweeping claims about learning behaviour skills and having them `naturally' transfer to other areas or contexts of a person's life. Depending upon a naturalized, rationalized teleology, generalizations such as the following can be made:

> It is important for all members of the group to buy into [a] safety principle- it promotes a sense of shared responsibility for everything the group does. The transfer from physical safety to emotional safety and health follows rather easily by implication (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.16).

The whole premise of transferability is thrown into disarray as soon as the coherence of the subject is thrown into question. Nothing follows easily by implication if, as I explore in Chapter Four, the "subject" is always decentered from itself, being wrought with contradictions and unpredictability if it is theorized as constructed through language and the unconscious. Progressive, rational change according to a set of expected behaviours cannot be expected.

Effects of learning transferability may occur. What types of learning that occur is a critical question. ABC discusses those effects that the program supporters, implicated in social relations, want to see. ABC programs, just like OB programs, are always already implicated in the discourse of the modern world. The disciplining of subjects occurs throughout the ABC experience, in visible and invisible ways.

ABC presumes a unitary subject but not to the complete exclusion of the social. The concept of transferability assumes that the individual functions within some sort of social context. The details of the social are subordinated to those of rehabilitating the individual. ABC theory, as laid out in Islands of Healing, never adequately theorizes the juncture between society and individual. Broad inferences and sweeping generalizations are made concerning how changes within individuals will carry over to their lives. These assumptions are made through observations of how the individual operates within the ABC group context. Very often, the group context becomes the surrogate for social relations, operating as the demonstration grounds for how these new changes within the individual will be played out in the "social" relations of the group. The subject within the ABC context becomes the classic information processor, taking whatever information it gets from "society" (the ABC group) and internalizing it for its own development. It is almost as if the ABC group becomes a more humanized laboratory, with group members being metaphorical rats, displaying appropriate "human" behaviour.

What gets forgotten in the presumed ABC scenario is that individuals in the modern world operate in many different "worlds", and that those "worlds", including the ABC group, are historically constructed. Social contexts are varied and sometimes vastly different. Individuals operate differently in each of these situations. ABC purports to demonstrate how it can change less than desirable behaviours, as if they are caused by something that is wrong within the individual. In this text there is never any conversation about how those "bad" behaviours may be symptoms of a different cause, or resistance against mainstream cultural values, or common and accepted practices within a certain subcultural context. True to form, ABC presumes there is not only one subject, but one "society" as well. The analysis is simplistic and unsupported. As the following example shows.

In the text, one reads that spiral goals are those ambitions stated by the client in consultation with the group as extensions of their personal goals within the ABC group context. They should apply to the individual's conduct outside and beyond the ABC group. This spiral goal setting process is done after a certain amount of time has been spent within the group, developing group norms and expectations (Schoel et al, 1988). There is little, if any mention of considering the client's personal history or present life context in developing these spiral goals. An individual may understand what the socially expected behaviour/outcome/goal "should" be. Without wanting to expose their contextual reasons for not setting that particular goal, they feel compelled/obliged to fulfill the "success" expectations set up by the program, counsellors and group members. This is an invisible effect, rather than a blatant command, and ABC adherents would never knowingly condone this form of coercion. Nonetheless, prescribing this kind of structure and expectation on a group could lead to goal setting whose effects are potentially unhealthy or even dangerous.

A specific example of the possible effects of this method is the spiral goal of "I will work on moving out of my foster home and back into my father's house. I'll do this by being on my best behaviour and by talking with my father" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.115). What if the individual who makes this goal is doing so because s/he understands "best behaviour" to be what the counselling program and other educational/social structures expect of her and that is what they deem as `successful'? What if "best behaviour" in her/his father's house means submitting quietly and compliantly to incestual abuse? For many incest survivors, the shame surrounding incest has the effect of being an extremely powerful silencer, both consciously and subconsciously (Butler, 1985).

A persistent theme throughout Islands of Healing is the invocation of romanticized traditional family values. There is a built-in assumption that returning to the biological parent's care/home is the best recourse. This is considered progress. For example, in the late 1980s, I was employed by a wilderness school that employed ABC techniques. Their provincial funding was contingent upon the improved residential placement of court-referred male youths at the end of a six week course. The top of this hierarchy was to facilitate "successful" return to the home of the biological parent(s). Every staff member was aware of this pressure, and even with the best of intentions, it would influence the decisions clients were encouraged to make.

ABC is touted as being a different form of treatment because it uses adventure activities to provide experiential learning. The basic tenet is that through doing and having unique learning experiences, clients will gain new insights into themselves and their behaviours. They can then take these new understandings and incorporate them into their "real" lives to improve themselves. Much like the critique I have made in my first chapter about gender analysis of outdoor education, experience should not be considered as originary and transparent in its meanings. Although shooting a set of Class IV rapids in a kayak will likely be interpreted as a powerfully clear and unique experience, what historically informs that experience must also be interrogated. I have been arguing that the ABC group is anything but neutral in how it creates experiences, and what histories individuals bring to bear on those experiences must be explored. Any politicized understanding of the ABC experience must start to deconstruct how those experiences are historically and contingently created. The implications of the values and ideas they create and reinforce must be acknowledged and constantly interrogated through changing ABC contexts.

Certain mainstream values are implicitly constructed in Islands of Healing. In the text, gender is used in particular ways to support traditional assumptions of femininity. How this representation of gendered behaviour is used implicitly informs my experience of reading the book as a woman. I may have any one of a number of responses to this rendering of gender. There are multiple readings that could be done by many individuals in different reading locations. It is the effects of these representations of traditional ways of being and values that ABC must start to become critically conscious of assessing. The most obvious reference to gender in Islands of Healing is the overwhelming use of the masculine pronoun and examples of masculine experiences which are used as explanatory devices. However, it is interesting to note where and how the feminine gender is used sparingly.

Akin to the psychology of women and some feminist psychology, the binary opposition between masculinity and femininity is maintained. Women are portrayed in examples as being caring, connected, and empathic individuals. In one case, the gendered subject "she" would learn from a successful belaying experience that she could "be more supportive of other family members during stressful periods" (Bacon in Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.20-21). This outcome is postulated, not demonstrated, and its construction belies the entrenched notions of gender in Western culture. Women's place is within the family, and to be supportive of that family is the paramount goal.

Other examples involving women introduce the concept of care. A feminine ethic of care is invoked which suggests women conduct their lives in a more caring way than men. In the section of the book that discusses how to develop empathy, the female pronoun is used (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.139). In another example, a female is described as improving her relational and caring skills through metaphorical experiences (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.34). It is not that caring is something women should not do, but that the representation of the concepts and the female gender reproduce repetitive, traditional expectations of what normative femininity is all about. This further entrenches psychology's understanding of gender.

Drawing out these potential scenarios is not to vilify ABC and everything it does. Unlike the undesirable outcomes previously described, very positive and socially "progressive" effects can be generated from ABC practices. Individuals can and do gain personal skills that benefit them in the social worlds they inhabit. The main point I would like to make is that given its heavy reliance on mainstream psychological discourse, ABC is trapped into a formulaic method that ultimately presumes a generalized response to a common method in improving a universal subject which if not transparent to others, should definitely be transparent to itself. The main implications of this are that socially sanctioned norms and values are perpetuated and entrenched, creating circumscribed ways of being for individuals. This social regulation and discipline precludes other forms of subjectivity and interpretations of individuals' actions. The individual is caught in the complicit space of helping to produce her or his own subjectification, forever in that space where the modern individual is subject and object, in contingent and colliding ways, in the same moment.

Chapter Four explores alternative conceptions of subjectivity where the subject is not necessarily presumed to have a unitary, prediscursive core that is discoverable. I consider how subjects are produced through discourse and therefore embody this contradictory position of subject and object. This includes a rendering of psychoanalytic theory and its relation to language and subject formation, gender performativity and the gendered subject, and a discussion of some of the potential effects of a "queer"[2] reading of the use of the family metaphor in ABC is done as a specific example of a potential disruptive strategy within AOE.

Notes

1. Interpellation, according to Henriques *et al* (1984, p.97), is:

> The subject recognizes her/himself as such through a process of recognition whereby the authority of the institution and its representatives, for example the parents and teachers, `hail' the individual. S/he recognizes her/himself through this relation, which is imaginary. In this view, the subject does not exist prior to its hailing or interpellation.

2. I use the word queer to identify a growing perspective on sexuality which encompasses lesbian, gay and other transgressive sexualities. Teresa de Lauretis (1991, p.v) suggests how it is a useful term:

> The term "queer"... was arrived at in the effort to avoid all of the fine distinctions [between different, non-dominant sexualities] in our discursive protocols, not to adhere to any one of the given terms, not to assume their ideological liabilities, but instead to both transgress and transcend them- or at the very least problematize them.

Chapter Four

GENDER PERFORMATIVITY AND THE FAMILY METAPHOR IN ADVENTURE BASED COUNSELLING

This chapter considers alternative ideas of subjectivity, gender, and political practice. After briefly reintroducing feminist psychology, I introduce the decentered subject of Lacanian psychoanalysis as a response to the mythic individual of psychological discourse. I then consider Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity and its role in the development of subjectivity. By redeploying erased and foreclosed versions of gender performativity, I end by suggesting potential disruptions to heterosexual hegemony reproduced in adventure based counselling. I interpret some potential effects of transgressive, hyperbolic lesbian performances through the poststructuralist theory of Judith Butler. This is done through a reading of the "family metaphor" as it is represented in Islands of Healing. These suggestions are described as potential strategies for direct-action politics. They are not described with the intention to supplant or override other forms of anti-homophobic political work, but to add another dimension to that political and theoretical project.

As I argued in Chapter Three, feminist psychology needs to be more reflexive in its theorizing. Although counselling theory is derived from various psychological theories, many understandings gained in therapy practice could be re-worked and integrated into counselling theory to understand better the intricacies of the social relations in which "women" exist. This production of knowledge (in therapy contexts) is part of what makes psychology a discursive formation.

Privileging gender is an important first step. Feminist therapy actively includes the political in its therapeutic practice, but feminist therapy is also implicated in the normative discourse of psychology which plays its role in social regulation. The theory should complicate ideas about gender and subjectivity to acknowledge the contradictory messages women bring to any situation (see Fine, 1992, for an excellent example of this). Strategic use of identity categories (such as gender) by subordinately positioned peoples is a political imperative, but opening up and contesting the understandings and legitimated uses of identity categories is as important a project (Butler, 1991). Poststructuralist "deconstruction" is one theoretical tactic for reconsidering and redeploying identity categories.

Many feminists are extremely wary of poststructural theory, some of them rejecting it outright. One aspect of this critique involves the postmodern tendency to relativism (Fraser, 1989). But as Jane Flax (1993, p.50) points out "relativism has meaning only as the partner of its binary opposite- universalism". Universal (e.g., patriarchal, androcentric) standards have been the targets of feminist analysis and politics. We live with the inequities that universal standards create. I cannot condone a feminist project which repeats universalism, even with a gynocentric focus.

Another complaint made by some feminists regarding poststructural theory is that it will potentially depoliticize feminism. At the historical moment in which feminism has given credence to gender as an analytical category, the claim is made that "woman" is being deconstructed out of existence. This critique of poststructuralism, and in particular deconstruction, is repudiated by Judith Butler (1992, p.15):

> To take the construction of the subject (or any other cherished notion) as a political problematic is not the same as doing away with the subject; to deconstruct the subject is not to negate or throw away the concept; on the contrary, deconstruction implies only that we suspend all commitments to that which the term "the subject", refers, and that we consider the linguistic functions it serves in the consolidation and concealment of authority. To deconstruct is not to negate or to dismiss, but to call into question and, perhaps most importantly, to open up a term, like the subject, to a reusage or redeployment that previously has not been authorized.[1]

It is critical at this historical juncture to consider current and developing formulations of terms such as sex, gender, woman, lesbian, queer and others.

I have come to poststructural theory through academic study and political practice. I am always confused by the claims that poststructuralism is depoliticizing and immaterial. Lesbians, and more specifically certain subcultures of lesbians (e.g., pro-sex, S/M, butch/femme couples among others), have been left out, made invisible, or denigrated within certain accounts of second wave feminist theory (Hollibaugh and Moraga, 1983). I have experienced heterosexism in the name of "sisterhood" within feminist political organizations. As a lesbian student, I have had to introduce "lesbian" content into certain feminist courses, and work hard to have it adequately represented. I have also experienced a whole range of sexist denigrations by inhabiting the position "woman" in late twentieth century Canada.

These experiences make poststructuralist theory appealing to me. It is a philosophy that is able to account for the contested and everchanging understandings of certain identity categories, including woman, lesbian, and queer. It helps me to interpret and understand complicated, contradictory messages I have experienced and continue to experience in certain situations. My ongoing challenge is to "translate" necessarily complicated ideas so that the language/discourse of feminist poststructuralism does not become elitist and inaccessible to those outside academe. However, this important translation work must not lose the complexity of analysis that I think this theory offers a feminist and/or queer political project.

> Poststructuralism poses two major challenges to feminist politics:
>
> To re-envisage subject positions that are capable of change beyond merely reproducing the inverse of what they are not; and to take seriously our own claims that discourses are practices which lie beyond as well as within language (Burman, 1990, p.220).

Discourses, through constant reproduction and reenactment of themselves by subjects, appear to create positions for individuals to take up. Often there are many different, sometimes contradictory positions for people to pursue. Discourses are constantly changing and being renegotiated and represented (Hollway, 1984). For example, gendered positions are definitely alive and well but they are not static or generalizable. Gender is a construction, and a very powerful construction, but it is not a prediscursive given. It creates positions which are discourse-dependent and indeterminate:

> When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one (Butler, 1990, p.6, emphasis in the original).

This conceptualization of gender removes it from any absolute origins and belies its historical construction within social contexts. This quote creates dissonance because it upsets "common sense", taken-for-granted notions. It forces one to acknowledge how pervasively ideas of sex and gender are mutually interdependent in their meaning construction. The success of gender discourse is to make oppositionally sexed subject positions appear inescapable. I use Butler's sex/gender example to introduce the idea that subjectivity is produced through discourse, and that production relies on powerful, dominant ideas and practices which inform and continually recreate ideals of femininity, masculinity and sexuality.

Production of Subjectivity Through Language

I wish to suggest alternative approaches to subjectivity which are necessarily tentative and incomplete as I attempt to subvert and circumvent dominant ideas about subjecitivity and agency. I outline only one aspect of the psychoanalytic explanation of subjectivity formation. I then consider the necessity of the subject becoming "sexed/gendered" to be rendered intelligible within discourse. So, I turn, hesitantly and very advisedly, to strands of psychoanalytic theory as it attempts to distance itself from the notion of a unitary, coherent individual, and tries to avoid the restrictive individual/society binary construction.

To adequately theorize subjectivity, there must be some accounting for the subject's investment in taking up one subject position over another (Hollway, 1984). For example, why do individuals position themselves as more "feminine" than "masculine"? How can we account for desire? Psychoanalytic theory is potentially helpful. Psychology, as a discipline, has generally shut the door on psychoanalysis. Because it gives space to the unconscious and our fundamental irrationality, psychoanalysis has resisted fitting into the empiricist model privileged in mainstream psychology (Henriques *et al*, 1984).

I am still very ambivalent about the use of psychoanalysis, especially the Lacanian version. I find the theoretical material extremely verbose, convoluted, complicated and baffling. I get stuck with its continued insistence to maintain the Freudian oedipal complex (albeit reworked with the symbolic phallus rather than the biological penis), which is still left intact in the reworkings of Lacan's work by French feminists such as Julia Kristeva or Luce Irigaray (see Burke, 1981; Grosz, 1981, among others). Jane Flax (1993) discusses how psychoanalysis in practice is organized as a regime of truth that creates contradictory political effects. I am willing to be convinced that it might be useful for theorizing the primacy and power of language and for considering a decentered subjectivity without relying on instinctual drives and pregiven subjects.

In reworking Freud's theory, Lacan places his emphasis on language, rather than the biological notions of drives or instincts. The subject is split and fragmentary from its moment of entry into language. This entry is based on desire and lack, which can only partially be articulated through language:

> The child uses his or her first words to establish, in fantasy, control over the loss of the object which gave satisfaction (the mother). As words displace the original object, we see the first step in the process of repression which forms the unconscious; entry into language inaugurates the production of subjectivity... This process introduces an inevitable distancing, or gap, between the infant and the object longed for, and in consequence any satisfaction that the infant obtains subsequently will always and irrevocably contain this loss within it (Henriques *et al*, p.215).

Because language is a social system, it is here that the social enters the formation of the unconscious, in its attempt to articulate desire and inevitably the conscious self comes to view itself as constructed through language. This is a step towards meshing the subject and the social (Henriques *et al*, 1984).

In that the unconscious is founded in symbolic representatives, signs, and memories generated in, by and through language, it unseats Freud's biologically-based subject and the unitary, rational individual of mainstream psychology. The subject is produced through symbolic relations. Psychoanalytic renderings of subjectivity support a theoretical account for "the extent to which will or agency is constantly subverted to desire, and the extent to which we behave and experience ourselves in ways which are often contradictory" (Henriques *et al*, 1984, p.205). Because of the inadequacies of language to transparently represent desire, a gap is created which is then (un)fulfilled through fantasy. This desire then permeates the workings of language. Although always idiosyncratic, there is a continuity to the subject, even though it is always fundamentally decentered from itself (Henriques *et al*, 1984).

This is one potential theorization of subjectivity which can help explain why individual subjects inhabit the (often contradictory) positions they do in discursive social relations. It is from this theoretical framework that analyses of the relations between motivation and the conditions a social practice creates can be conducted in a politicized manner. It also acknowledges that mainstream psychology is not to be dismissed outright. It has and continues to have a profound influence on the social relations and practices of the modern world (Unger, 1990).

This partial consideration of subjectivity does not theorize how a subject becomes gendered, or how a "sexed" body affects subjectivity. Even posing a statement like "how a subject becomes gendered" falls into the trap of presuming a prediscursive subject on which the social acts. To explore these issues further, I take up Judith Butler's work on sex, gender, compulsory heterosexual matrices, and subjectivity to complicate the idea of a decentered subject. This exposes not just the construction of the decentered subject, but its constant and inescapable performative reiteration.

Judith Butler and Gender Performativity

Butler argues that for a subject to be/come intelligible within culture, it must be sexed/gendered. This is an inescapable, repetitive process which involves reiteration of maculinized or feminized performatives. But, there is always a gap in the performativity of gender, in that with every repetitive gender citation, there is never a transparent, perfect reflection of the representation. Every performance/act is always only a partial replica of the purported original. Therefore, there is an imperative for differentiated, oppositional gender practices to be constantly reenacted, however imperfectly, to continually prop up and perpetuate the naturalized myths that presuppose the heterosexualized masculine/feminine construction of subjectivity (Butler, 1990; Butler, 1993).

I touched on the problematic distinction between sex and gender in Chapter Three. Most contemporary feminist theory relies on an idea that sex is a natural, prediscursive given on which "culture" acts. The effects generated by culture are considered gender. This construction supposedly frees "women" from their immutable, biological sex by suggesting that it is from constructions of gender norms, which are socially produced and therefore changeable, that some understanding of politicized gendered behaviour can proceed. However, this account leaves unexamined the status of an undertheorized, prediscursive "sex".

If gender is the "apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established", the naturalized idea of a fictive, anatomically-determined sex is produced and maintained by gender constructions (Butler, 1990, p.7). Butler (1990) continues:

> There is no recourse to a body that has not always already been interpreted by cultural meanings; hence, sex could not qualify as a prediscursive anatomical facticity. Indeed, sex, by definition, will be shown to have been gender all along (p.8).

Sex, in this account, is produced (as opposed to being prediscursive origin) to *appear* as naturalized and prior to culture through constructed understandings of gender. Butler reiterates this idea again in her most recent work, Bodies That Matter:

> If gender consists of social meanings that sex assumes, then sex does not *accrue* social meanings as additive properties but, rather, is *replaced* by the social meanings it takes on; sex is relinquished in the course of that assumption, and gender emerges, not as a term in a continued relationship of opposition to sex, but as the term which absorbs and displaces "sex", the mark of its full substantiation into gender (emphasis in the original, 1993, p.5).

Sex becomes a fiction, an insubstantive phantasm that is produced by and through gender. The success of this fiction, however, is its ability to conceal its constructed ideal and present itself within discourse as a founding, natural origin. The indisputable "fact" of sex is then used as an argument to "legitimately" subordinate and discriminate against women and lesbians within dominant discourses.

But how are we to make sense of corporeal bodies, if everything is an effect of gender? How do bodies come to be "sexed" especially if sex is a phantasmatic construction? And isn't the subject subjectivated to the sex s/he is? The subject, to be made intelligible within discourse, must become "sexed". A first act of "girling" is usually the medical pronouncement at birth of, "its a girl!". The act of naming brings the "girl" into "the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender" (Butler, 1993, p.7).

The individual is inaugurated into a lifetime engaged in reiterative, performative acts based on a gender identification. Gender exists to support and maintain heterosexuality. This identification is developed through authoritative and temporal imperatives that cannot be avoided. There is a continual disclaiming of what one is not:

> The forming of a subject requires an identification with the normative phantasm of "sex", and this identification takes place through a repudiation which produces a domain of abjection, a repudiation without which the subject cannot emerge (Butler, 1993, p.3).

The gendered subject that emerges is defined by what it cannot be, based on a binary delineation according to what is naturalized as "sex". Paradoxically, "sex" is produced negatively as a positivity in discourse. Through constant, discursive repudiation, the gendered individual is, to greater or lesser degrees, constructed as pervasive and powerful. This works, in part, through granting "sexed" bodies a biological or prediscursive origin in discourse. And when one concedes that some part of sex or sexual materiality (e.g., anatomical parts, chromosomal differences) is undeniable, one immediately adds to the continued sedimentation of the formation of a fictive, naturalized "sex" (Butler, 1993). By successfully placing gender, sexuality and desire within the individual subject, the mechanisms of social control based on gender and regulation of sexual desire are effectively masked.

The production of a domain of abjected beings, those who are excluded from the heterosexually gendered discourse, becomes the constitutive field of that dominant discourse. This zone of uninhabitability, whose occupants are not afforded subject status, is the necessary "outside" of the dominant discourse for the gendered subject (Butler, 1993). This constitutive "outside" exists at the contested and tenuous borders of discourse. It produces the potential for "the constitutive force of the exclusion, erasure, violent foreclosure, abjection and its disruptive return within the very terms of discursive legitimacy" (Butler, 1993, p.8). Political opportunities can be created for those who are disidentified to expose, subvert and redeploy the exclusionary matrices of heterosexualized gender practices as the fictive performatives they are.

So, not only is the gendered subject delimited by what it is not within a heterosexually differentiated framework, it also has no origin:

> Gender is a kind of imitation for which there is no original; in fact, it is a kind of imitation that produces the very notion of the original as an effect and consequence of the imitation. ...Precisely because it is bound to fail, and yet endeavours to succeed, the project of heterosexual identity is propelled into an endless repetition of itself (Butler, 1991, p.21)

Gender is perpetuated through performative repetition of signifying practices. Performativity is more than just a discrete act; it is based on and informed by past norms; it is a reiteration of what is always already constructed. "Subjected to gender, but subjectivated by gender, the "I" neither precedes [n]or follows the process of this gendering, but emerges only within and as the matrix of gender relations themselves" (Butler, 1993, p.7).

There is no acting "I" who stands behind a performative. The performative itself is the result of a long term sedimentation of discourse. This discourse has a history which is both constitutive and temporal by which the subject is mobilized, both in its historical context and contemporary usage. The subject is not forced to be compliant with the normative performative, or directed by it, but is produced *through* the performative within discourse. This construction is "a process of reiteration by which both `subjects' and `acts' come to appear at all. There is no power that acts, but only a reiterated acting that is power in its persistence and instability" (Butler, 1993, p.9). The use of the Foucaultian notion of productive power indicates Butler's reliance on previous discourses in her theoretical constructions.

That "acts" and "subjects" are produced through discourse, and mobilized by it, does not imply that they are simply ethereal effects of abstract constructions. "Acts" and "subjects" are material, but their materiality is not prior to their productions. There is not a pregiven "body", as undifferentiated neutral substance, on which discourse then acts. Butler (1993, p.9) proposes "a return to the notion of matter, not as a site or surface, but as a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter". This is how bodies materialize and how bodies come to matter. Bodies are enabled by repetitive gender performatives to remain intelligible within the dominant discourse by reproducing likenesses of themselves over and over again. Through attempted repetitions of sanctioned gender acts, individuals and their physical bodies are produced through discourse. This is not to say that subjectivity is necessarily determined by discourse. "By virtue of ... reiteration, ... gaps and fissures are opened up as the constitutive instabilities" of gendered subjectivities within discourse (Butler, 1993, p.10). Individuals, from within gaps produced through inexact gender repetitions, can potentially redefine discourse and not be completely determined by it. It is here that Butler proposes her theorized, political strategies which may be taken up by lesbians and gay men.

From within the "gaps" and "fissures" of unstable gender configurations, a strategic redeployment of the heterosexual matrix back onto itself can disrupt its seemingly intact logic and expose its naturalized facade as the violent fiction it is. Spaces generated by the inexact repetition of gender performatives, creates an opportunity where the performative can be changed to disrupt and transgress the expected gender norm which supports the heterosexual matrix. Specific, parodic or hyperbolic lesbian deployments of heterosexual constructs can have denaturalizing effects on heterosexual hegemony. "They can and do become the site of parodic contest and display that robs compulsory heterosexuality of its claims to naturalness and originality" (Butler, 1990, p.124).

I now explore how an illusive, but presumed, stable gender core is used to regulate sexuality and related aspects of subjectivity within the confines of compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1990). I discuss how the use of the "family" metaphor within adventure based counselling practices forecloses certain possibilities for lesbian and gay participants and leaders. I will do one of a multitude of possible readings of gender performativity within ABC, as there are many lesbian, gay and queer perspectives on political and theoretical strategies. These are my suggestions and proposed strategies which I extrapolate from the use of traditional, dominant constructions of family in

Islands of Healing. I use Butler's work to interpret potential effects of redeploying transgressive gender performatives to subvert traditional notions of family.

Adventure Based Counselling and the Family Metaphor

As part of its counselling strategy, ABC invokes "family" as a constructive metaphor for changing behaviour. The family unit is described as a mutual understanding, a common experience shared by everyone (Schoel *et al*, 1988). "Family is a powerful symbol for everyone. Either you have a family or you wish you had one...Because of this universality of experience, everyone can relate to the metaphor" (Schoel *et al*, p.96-97). In Islands of Healing, the "healthy" family is the ideal to which the ABC group aspires. This unit is described as an experience that everyone knows, where individuals relate to one another positively and in supportive manners. Each family member has value. ABC guidelines suggest that family should be a place where the best is brought out in each person. In an ideal family, there are ground rules to live by which everyone knows and follows.

What is left presumed and unwritten in the text are the other "naturalized" requirements of family which continue to be perpetuated in and through discourse. The mythic ideal, with its own discursive history, presupposes a heterosexual union, where a man and woman are joined in lawful wedlock, where the head of the household is the male wage earner, where the "wife and mother" is the caring, nurturing female homemaker, and where the perpetuation of this family ideal by the next generation of children is expected. This construction is supported in the text through the use of a mother-father analogy used in co-leadership, and women are used as referents in the sections pertaining to caring and empathy. This performative ideal of family is well sedimented as a "natural" idea. With the current resurgence of traditional "family values" discourse, this ideal appears to be one which requires constant reiteration to recreate and reestablish its embattled and besieged foundations. By not being critically reflexive about this "family values" discourse, the authors of Islands of Healing implicitly add to promulgation of the ideas and values of this discourse.

The traditional family construction is a contemporary social myth which is rarely realized. Nonetheless, the discursive understanding of the concept is probably one of the most universally recognized ideals in Western society. Butler argues that when a material effect (like family) is taken as an epistemological given, the power/discourse regime is most effective. "This is a move of empiricist foundationalism that, in accepting this constituted effect as a primary given, successfully buries and masks the genealogy of power relations by which it is constituted" (Butler, 1993, p.35). What types of power relations does this heterosexualized formation have for homosexual peoples as it is used within ABC settings?

As described in Islands of Healing, one of the first places family rhetoric is used in the ABC formula is during the intake interview. Once the potential participant has explained to the interviewer why they want to be in the ABC group, the questioning moves towards ascertaining what goals the participant might want to consider within the ABC group. To draw out this information, the text suggests posing several questions at this point in the intake interview. One of these is: "What would you like your family life to be like?" (Schoel *et al*, p.52).

A prospective participant who is lesbian or gay may have several potential responses to this inquiry. If their family experience has been positive, they may have no need to question a family structure predicated on the standard heterosexual unit. They may also be lucky enough to come from a family background where homosexuality is accepted and alternative notions of family are embraced. The prospective ABC participant may have enough confidence to share their sexual orientation with the interviewer, possibly risking immediate or future homophobic response.

However, knowing the powerful, normative discourse around family and homophobia (and their dangerous consequences) in Western culture, a lesbian/gay participant could face an immediate dilemma in responding to this question. Given her/his position of subordination within the ABC hierarchy (leader-client), and the powerful pull of "closetting" discourse in producing lesbian/gay subjectivity, the participant may not feel safe enough to answer honestly. A response of: "My same-sex partner and I would raise our children and..." or "My family wouldn't hate/ignore/abuse me because I'm lesbian/gay" could be met with the same homophobic violence and disregard that the participant has come to know and expect within discourse. Therefore, the lesbian/gay participant, when confronted with such a question, is likely to answer with the appropriate heterosexist, "family-values" responses. This reinforces, through discourse, the hegemonic understandings of what family is, and reiterates through the same homophobic discourse that the lesbian/gay participant is constructed as the "outside" of the sanctioned, dominant discourse. The act of replying with the standard response which condones the reproductive family configuration, continues to sediment the idea that the constructed effect of family is a naturalized real. This helps to ensure the continued success of heterosexist family values discourse.

This scenario has immediately presumed that the ABC interviewer is straight. The intake interview, if done by an ABC leader who is lesbian/gay, or straight and gay-supportive, could subvert the questioning process, either by refusing to invoke the family reference or by redefining what family represents. Is there a place where a lesbian could be "out" in an ABC context? What does that "outness" imply?

If a leader is "out" as a lesbian, what does that mean? Is that person out to staff but not to clients, out to both staff and clients, but not the park warden she meets on the trail? Regardless of an individual's intent to be out in all aspects of her/his life, a person is generally presumed to be heterosexual. Furthermore, it is almost impossible to "remain in or to reenter the closet in some or all segments of their lives" (Sedgwick, 1990, p.68). Being "out" of the "closet" is a very difficult thing to pin down. For every time you leave the closet and come out, it redefines the closet. Whatever you come out as, creates yet another closet for those left out of one's new "outness". The signifier "lesbian", when made static, presupposes certain attributes and forecloses others. Certain lesbians will be proscribed when the term "lesbian" is claimed in the process of coming out (Butler, 1991; Butler, 1993). Implicitly, whoever uses the word lesbian adds to the creation and reproduction of the identity category, with or without intending to do so. Using the signifier `lesbian' immediately involves privileging certain definitional characteristics of lesbianism over others. For example, a lesbian may come out and identify (overtly or covertly) that lesbianism has nothing to do with sex or sexuality, it is a form of deep emotional and spiritual connection with other women. The use of the signifier "lesbian" in this way proscribes women who may consider sex and sexuality (ranging from "vanilla" to hard-core s/m) integral to their use of the term "lesbian". This is a very complicated issue because it is also inextricably bound up with issues of racism, classism and sexism.

Questioning the meaning of politicized signifiers must constantly haunt any political endeavour that uses contested identity categories. This should not be considered paralyzing. To the contrary, it is an opportunity for the democratization of queer/lesbian politics. Through constantly interrogating and pushing the borders of the terms, new and unforeseen opportunities are created with which the normative, dominant discourse can be continually, and unexpectedly disrupted (Butler, 1993). This is a critical insight gained from poststructural deconstruction.

There is a section in the ABC text that discusses the use of co-leadership for groups. "Following the family analogy, co-leaders can be "mom and dad"" (Schoel *et al*, 1988, p.155). I use this heterosexual dyadic construction to illustrate two points. The first is how "being out" in the traditional sense (those around you knowing that you are a "lesbian") is not necessarily a subversive act. And second, I propose how a strategic redeployment of the mom and dad role-modelling structure could potentially subvert the naturalness of the dominant family narrative.

Out homosexuals in North America currently live in a dangerous time. It is a political act to be out as lesbian/gay. But coming out, in itself, is not necessarily a sufficiently potent political act to upset heterosexual hegemony. For example, an ABC leader identifies as a lesbian and other staff members know that she is gay. Coming out as a lesbian initially is likely to be somewhat disruptive. She is upsetting the expected feminine gender performative by proclaiming a sexual affinity with women. Ongoing forms of coming out or re-entering the closet will be continually enacted. After initially coming out, she may not draw attention to her sexuality and stop calling into question the dominant heterosexual framework by not reiterating her lesbian performative in the public workplace. This will, to some extent, define her "lesbian" identity, leaving other forms of lesbian invisible.

The lesbian leader may agree to play along as the "mom" half of the "mom and dad" co-leadership team, reinforcing and reiterating established heterosexual gender performatives. Even though it is known among staff that she "is" not heterosexual (and therefore dissonant with the expected, sanctioned wife and mother role), she still reiterates the performance of a feminized heterosexual mother.

By not calling into question the fundamental heterosexual unit and its expectations through the mother/father role modelling, the critical moment is lost. As Gayle Rubin (1993) points out in her sex hierarchy, certain forms of sexuality are more acceptable than others. If one must be homosexual, it may be tolerable as long as it is not made present nor ever flaunted. It is alright, inasmuch as it approaches the ideal heterosexual union which is married, monogamous, reproductive and private. It is in circumstances such as these, where the homosexual almost approximates everything heterosexual, that being "out" loses some of its critical edge.

One of the most powerful implications of queer theory and politics for me is that it is about sexuality. It is about fighting homophobia in all its forms, and trying to make homosexuality less subordinated. Within the outdoor education context, Mary McClintock (1991) has done work on directly confronting homophobia and heterosexism. She employs strategies such as not letting homophobic jokes go unaddressed, educating self and others about homosexuality, and suggesting that homosexuals are productive individuals and that homophobia stands in the way of individual potentials. McClintock suggests that lesbians and gays be encouraged to be who they are. I do not think that queer politics is about making sexuality more acceptable, because ultimately that acceptability begins to approximate the dominant heterosexual discourse. It is for these reasons that I think the enterprises of direct-action, "in your face" lesbians and gay men can be interpreted in powerful ways so that queer sexualities do not remain invisible in the constitutive "outside" referred to by Butler. Some very brave, abjected individuals fight back by blatantly refusing to let their sexualities be ignored, erased, or lost.

Following the necessity for increased visibility, another "mom and dad" analogy might be redeployed for strategic effect. For example, two female ABC leaders, both willing to mock the implicit assumptions of the mom and dad co-leadership idea, self-reflexively play out the assumptions. It might sound something like this: "Hi group, we are Kate and Joan and we are your ABC leaders. In our leadership training we were given mom and dad roles as metaphors for leadership. Given our gender, we've had to be a bit creative. So today Kate will be "dad" and Joan will be "mom". Tomorrow we'll switch around so that you get the best of both of us. We'd hate to have anyone grow up without a proper male role model, and we have to be clear about who the Father Figure is here, so today it's Kate, but tomorrow it will be Joan and this way you will get two perspectives each on masculine and feminine role models..." I abbreviate, and perhaps I am a bit blatant, but the implications are there. As I understand Butler's project, one takes certain established notions (such as traditional forms of heterosexualized family and parenting), and expose them parodically for the fictions they are. It is something which would have to be done skillfully and strategically so that it would be "read" or understood as the parody it intends to be.

The Kate and Joan scenario illustrates the notions of gender-bending (e.g., a female sexed body, the leader, being used to play out a male gender role, the "father") used to disrupt notions of naturalized sex and gender expectations. To take this reflexive leadership example a radical step further, Kate and Joan could come out to their group as lesbians. This continues to further disrupt the heterosexualized parenting dyad. "Gender-bending" is not that uncommon a practice. A woman acting in the social role of the "father" might be a stretch that some people could easily accept. Being confronted with two lesbians who mock the reproductive heterosexual basis of the mom and dad unit, could potentially force participants to acknowledge the powerful presumptions about the basis of the heterosexual family. Within dominant discourse, it seems intuitively "unnatural" for two lesbians to embrace the parenting metaphor. This may create a space where homosexual people could be affirmed in the ABC context. The radicalness of the parody could also force lesbians and gays in an ABC group further into the closet. Everything is dangerous. This strategy necessitates risking considerable social stricture and personal cost which are borne by the individuals who pursue these types of strategies and tactics.

In another part of the book Islands of Healing, the family metaphor is used again as a way of compelling participants to follow through on commitments, and to keep contractual agreements. Marriage vows are put forth as exemplary of one type of model to emulate (Schoel *et al*, 1988). Hypothetically, an ABC group leader could choose to utilize this metaphor in a group where a female member is out as a lesbian. The normative nature of the institution of marriage has effectively blinded the leader to how he implicitly proscribes the lesbian. Marriage is predicated on heterosexual unions, and in Alberta, as in most of North America, it is not legally sanctioned for same-sex unions. As lesbians cannot legally marry, they are denied the rights and privileges that come with marriage. Marriage vows are ineffective as a productive metaphor for lesbians.

However, I want to suggest a scenario where there might be an alternative way to interpret the redeployment of the marriage vows metaphor. Heterosexual marriage vows could be parodically mocked by lesbians to expose the constructed status of their sanctified stature. I am inspired here by a series of photos by Della Grace (1991), some commentary on those photos by Sarah Schulman (1991), and theory by Judith Butler.

A lesbian, "out" to her ABC group, invites them to her "gay wedding". She has decided to exchange vows with her partner, after spending time in the ABC group, working with them on a goal about her need to learn to commit to, and honor contracts. She explains to her ABC leader and group members that applying the marriage vows metaphor to her own life seems important and she wants them to be at the ceremony. On the day, people arrive.

Della Grace has produced a series of photos entitled "The Ceremony". I appropriate the description of these images to explain how potentially a lesbian in the ABC group could express her version of a wedding ceremony. In the photo series, two young women are depicted in their early twenties:

> at what appears to be a wedding ceremony. The sequence mirrors the kind of typical family photos, sure to be placed later in a plastic-covered souvenir album. The groom is topless with a leather harness, wristband, a studded belt and leather cap with inlaid brim. Her head is shaved. The bride wears long, formal rubber gloves with wristbands matching her betrothed's belt. She is dressed in a bodice, double earings and lipstick with a delicate white wedding veil over streaked blond hair. The surrounding atmosphere is joyous. In many of the photos the women are in movement, shot outside, on a grassy hill overlooking a tree-lined section of London. All their gestures indicate happiness, fun, freedom, and bravado...(It is compelling to see) the daring with which the women recuperate the most sacred heterosexual ritual and do it topless, outside and in leather (Schulman, 1991, p.4).

I realize the scenario I have just produced is fiction, and is based on a parodic photographic representation. But as Butler argues, lesbians and gays are using theatricality (e.g., traditions of drag balls, cross-dressing, butch-femme performances) to be political. "This kind of citation will emerge as *theatrical* to the extent that it *mimes and renders hyperbolic* the discursive convention that it also *reverses* (Butler, 1993, p.232, emphasis in the original). Redefining the naturalized expectations of weddings is a productive moment, where lesbians insert themselves into the dominant discourse, without entirely capitulating to it.

Perhaps the marriage vows scenario is outrageous but it can be interpreted as a redeployment of the naturalized heterosexual hegemony as only constructed and not some constitutive "real":

> Mobilized by the injuries of homophobia, theatrical rage reiterates those injuries precisely through an "acting out", one that does not merely repeat or recite those injuries, but that also deploys...to shatter the epistemic blindness to an increasingly graphic and public homosexuality (Butler, 1993, p.233).

If ABC continues to suggest using the family metaphor as it does, it implicitly leaves out homosexual persons. But like all contested identity categories, someone or something will be left out in identity categories. The categories themselves are only constructions, and are therefore open to redefinition, from the the subtle to the graphic.

It is often difficult to remember that concepts like sex and gender, and the ideological constructions based on those concepts (e.g., family), are long term effects of repeated constructions. Butler has explained powerfully that we are caught in very complicated and sedimented performatives (of femininity/ masculinity) which construct subjectivity in very deep ways. Butler's attempt to understand corporeal materiality as produced through discourse is helpful to unseat "naturalized" conceptions such as sex, sexuality or family. Using graphic parody to expose these constructions and their ideological implications is a viable strategy. My reworking of the family metaphor is only one of many potential sites of disruption which could be found within the book Islands of Healing or adventure outdoor education. Sometimes it requires a hyperbolic "jolt" to remind us of the contingency of the "natural", to constantly remind us to "denaturalize" it. I understand this constant vigilance to be a life's work.

Notes

1. I thank Debra Shogan for bringing this quote to my attention.

Chapter Five

SUMMARY AND STRATEGIES

In this thesis, I have tried to expose and discuss several effects that are produced through various adventure outdoor education discourses. My feminist and queer political perspectives have informed the particular readings I have chosen to do. As I have indicated throughout the analysis, it is an incomplete attempt. This is not to say that what I have interpreted is insufficient, but that there are many more effects from AOE that remain uninterrogated. I am also complicitous in AOE discourse in that I am still involved in a small way with AOE in several leadership capacities. I have not completely rejected the whole project. And although I have tried to expose some of its less than desirable outcomes in this thesis, they are from my perspective as a white, middle class, well-educated lesbian. This leaves many other voices and perspectives out. I have problematized AOE in three general ways.

In Chapter Two, I use Michel Foucault's theoretical work on power, social regulation and the disciplining of modern bodies and populations. I find his work compelling because he resists the trap of an individual/society dualism. The world's problems cannot be blamed on an overarching conspiratorial society, but there is also no recourse to a fully agentic, liberal individual. The complex weaving of the two through insidious forms of productive power, creates an analysis of the modern world that I find interesting, complex and powerful. I use this work to analyze how Outward Bound practices are complicitous in regulating the modern individual.

To understand the modern individual, I find that the evolution of psychological theory needed to be explored. I do this in Chapter Three and extend a Foucaultian-type analysis to adventure based counselling. I expose the contructed and historically discursive nature of the "subject" of psychology, calling into question its claims to legitimacy. I look to feminist psychology for alternative renderings of subjectivity and find that it was still implicated in the normative understandings of traditional psychology. Aspects of the project of ABC, particularly the use of transfer theory and progressive goal setting, are called into question. ABC relies on psychology's assumption that individuals are essentially unitary subjects and my interpretations demonstrate some of the weaknesses of that assumption.

In Chapter Four I discussed how subjectivity is produced through language and discourse, rather than being a pregiven essence. Subjectivity is necessarily gendered, and Judith Butler's work on gender performativity is used to overview that process. Heterosexuality, as the motivating basis for oppositional gender configurations, is called into question as a natural category. The effects of the traditional family metaphor invoked in ABC are subjected to a queer reading where the effects of possible queer political strategies are discussed through Butler's theory.

I do not want to suggest a "new" version of AOE. I do not think that I could do an effective enough reworking of the AOE project to justify the effort required. And what this thesis, and particularly Foucault's work has drawn out for me, is that I would be fighting an extremely powerful and well entrenched philosphy of modern social control. My strategies now are more contextual, specific and subversive. I think the micropolitical approach can be very strategically and powerfully utilized. To clearly explain why I hesitate to propose strategies, I will return to my example from Chapter Three of the incest survivor being unwittingly encouraged to return to the abuser's home. This example prompts the question of how ABC would be revisioned for incest survivors.

For me, the critical point is that ABC can be revisioned to accommodate more specifically and carefully the unique needs of survivors of sexual abuse. This is both a strength and weakness of ABC. It can adapt to certain "identity" needs, attempting to eliminate potential harmful and negative effects. Individuals can be trained to be sensitive to any one of a number of issues such as sex, sexuality, age, abuse survivors, and race. For those people committed to that work, it is important and required. Working with incest survivors is not my choice of work. But I do think that if I choose to lead within an AOE or ABC type context, it is my responsibility to try to be sensitive to issues that affect individuals outside the dominant discourse, whether those individuals are abuse survivors or lesbians or native young offenders. It should be the responsibility of an AOE leader, through her/his leadership training, to try and identify contexts where participants are likely outside the dominant discourse. This could help unsuspecting ABC leaders to not create situations where individuals are placed in compromised positions.

This flexibility also places ABC as a typical modern program which is productive, constantly creating opportunities for itself to be recreated and spread through discourse. It also runs the risk that is inherent in any identity project. There is no overarching formula that will work for any one group, because within any group there are always differences, and always those individuals or issues left outside. It is next to impossible to train leaders to be sensitive to every difference, to every identity category and their political needs. This is not to give up on that work, but to acknowledge that it is probably never-ending.

Contesting identity categories is productive and powerful work, not negative and regressive. I think that the dominant understandings of many identity categories (woman, black, lesbian, gay and so on) are sufficiently powerful and pervasive that various forms of political strategies are needed. Constantly questioning identity categories can only make a political project more powerful and inclusive. The dominant discourse will ensure that the category does not disappear, or become "deconstructed out of existence".

My strategies are now to be as self-reflexive as possible publicly. This includes interrogating my own work. For example, this project does not deal with the production of race and/or racism in any rigorous way. I do not implicate myself in any process of racialization. I see that as a large gap in this piece. This absence is a large "othering" on my part. I am sure that I have blindly and implicitly constructed a white, Eurocentric version of AOE and its practices through the exclusion and erasure of any serious race analysis. My "whiteness" and its dominance is constructed by the raced "other". I hope that my use of identity categories of lesbian, gay, queer, and homosexual are disrupted and deconstructed for the lack of analysis of the production of race. Perhaps it is the next piece of work I need to do.

REFERENCES

Allen, S. (1987). "Risk Recreation: A Literature Review and Conceptual Model", in High Adventure Outdoor Pursuits: Organization and Leadership. Edited by Joel Meier *et al* , Columbus: Publishing Horizons, pp.95-130.

Ashley, F. (1990). "Ethnic Minorities Involvement with Outdoor Experiential Education", in J. Miles and S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education (pp.369-373). State College, PA: Venture.

Bialeschki, D. and Henderson, K. (1993). "Expanding Outdoor Opportunities for Women", Parks and Recreation, pp.36-40, August.

Birkett, B. and Peascod, B. (1989). Women Climbing: 200 Years of Achievement. Seattle: The Mountaineers.

Blum, A. (1980). Annapurna: A Woman's Place. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Buell, L. (1983). Outdoor Leadership Competency: A Manual for Self-Assessment and Staff Evaluation. Greenfield: Environmental Awareness Publications.

Burke, C. (1981). "Irigaray Through the Looking Glass". Feminist Studies. Vol.7, No.2, pp.288-306.

Burman, E. (1990). "Differing with Deconstruction: A Feminist Critique". In I. Parker and J. Shotter (Eds.), Deconstructing Social Psychology (pp.208-220). London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1991). "Imitation and Gender Insubordination", In D. Fuss (Ed.), Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories (pp.13-31). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1992). "Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of "Postmodernism"", In J. Butler and J. Scott (Eds.), Feminists Theorize the Political (pp.3-21). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex". New York: Routledge.

Butler, S. (1985). Conspiracy of Silence: The Trauma of Incest. Volcano, CA: Volcano Press.

Couch, O. (1992) "The National Indian Youth Leadership Project's Zuni SAR Team Program: Combining Challenge/Adventure with Meaningful Experience". In G. Hanna (Ed.), Celebrating Our Tradition, Charting Our Future: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education. (pp.144-150) Banff, AB: Association for Experiential Education.

Crawford, M. and Marecek, J. (1989). "Feminist Theory, Feminist Psychology: A Bibliography of Epistemology, Critical Analysis, and Applications". Psychology of Women Quarterly. Vol.13, 1989, pp.477-491.

da Silva, R. (1992). Leading Out: Women Climbers Reaching for the Top. Seattle: Seal Press.

Dattilo, J. and Murphy, W. (1987). "High Adventure for Everyone: Implications for People with Disabilities", In J. Meier *et al* (Eds.), High Adventure Outdoor Pursuits: Organization and Leadership. (pp.49-58). Columbus: Publishing Horizons.

de Lauretis, T. (1991). "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities- An Introduction". differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies. Vol.3, No.2, pp.iii-xviii.

Dreyfuss, H. and Rabinow, P. (1983). Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Ewert, A. (1983). "Outdoor Adventure and Self-Concept: A Research Analysis", College of Human Development and Performance, Department of Recreation and Park Management, Center of Leisure Studies, University of Oregon, pp.1-33.

Ewert, A. (1989). Outdoor Adventure Pursuits: Foundations, Models, and Theories. Columbus: Publishing Horizons.

Ewert, A. and Hollenhurst, S. (1990). "Risking It on Wildlands: The Evolution of Adventure Recreation". Journal of Environmental Education. Vol.21, No.3, 1990, pp.29-35.

Fine, M. (1992). "Coping with Rape: Critical Perspectives on Consciousness", In M. Fine (Ed.), Disruptive Voices: The Possibilities of Feminist Research (pp.61-76). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Fine, M. and Merle Gordon, S. (1992). "Feminist Transformations of/Despite Psychology", In M. Fine (Ed.), Disruptive Voices: The Possibilities of Feminist Research (pp.1-25). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Flax, J. (1992). "The End of Innocence", In J. Butler and J. Scott (Eds.), Feminists Theorize the Political. (pp.445-463). New York: Routledge.

Flax, J. (1993). Disputed Subjects: Essays on Psychoanalysis, Politics and Philosophy. New York: Routledge.

Ford, P. (1981). Principles and Practices of Outdoor/ Environmental Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1983). "The Subject and Power", In H. Dreyfuss and P. Rabinow (Eds.), Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. (2nd ed.), (pp.208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Foucault, M. (1984). "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History", In P. Rabinow (Ed.), The Foucault Reader. (pp.76-100). New York: Pantheon.

Fraser, N. (1989) Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Gavey, N. (1989). "Feminist Poststructuralism and Discourse Analysis: Contributions to Feminist Psychology" Psychology of Women Quarterly. Vol.13, pp.459-475.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Godfrey, R. (1980). Outward Bound: Schools of the Possible. New York: Anchor Press.

Gore, J. (1992). The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth. New York: Routledge.

Grace, D. (1991). Love Bites. London:GMP.

Graydon, D. (Ed.). (1992). Mountaineering: The Freedom of the Hills (5th ed.). Seattle: The Mountaineers.

Greene, J. and Thompson, D. (1990). "Outward Bound USA". In J. Miles and S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education. (pp.5-9). State College, PA: Venture.

Grosz, E. (1981). Sexual Subversions: Three French Feminists. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Hanna, G. (1992). "Preface", In G. Hanna (Ed.). Celebrating Our Tradition, Charting Our Future: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education. Banff, AB:Association for Experiential Education.

Harding, S. (1990). "Feminism, Science, and the Anti-Enlightenment Critiques". In L. Nicholson (Ed.), Feminism/Postmodernism (pp.83-106) New York: Routledge.

Hare-Mustin, R. and Marecek, J. (1990a). "On Making a Difference". In R. Hare-Mustin and J. Marecek (Eds.), Making a Difference: Psychology and the Construction of Gender (pp.1-21). New Haven: Yale University.

Hare-Mustin, R. and Marecek, J. (1990b). "Gender and the Meaning of Difference: Postmodernism and Psychology" In R. Hare-Mustin and J. Marecek (Eds.), Making a Difference: Psychology and the Construction of Gender (pp.22-64). New Haven: Yale University.

Henderson, K. (1992). "Breaking with Tradition: Women and Outdoor Pursuits". Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, pp.49-51, February.

Henderson, K. and Bialeschki, D. (1987) "Viva La Diferencia! Male/Female Differences Can Contribute to Positive Growth in all Outdoor Learning", Camping Magazine, pp.20-22, February.

Henderson, K. and Bialeschki, D. (1986). "Outdoor Experiential Education (for Women Only)", Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Association of Experiential Education, pp.35-41.

Henriques, J. *et al* (Eds.). (1984). Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation, and Subjectivity. London: Methuen.

Hollibaugh, A. and Moraga, C. (1983). "What We're Rollin Around in Bed With: Sexual Silences in Feminism", In A. Snitow *et al* (Eds.), Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality, (pp.394-405). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Hollway, W. (1991). "The Psychologization of Feminism or the Feminization of Psychology?". Feminism and Psychology. Vol.1, No.1, pp.29-37.

Hollway, W. (1984). "Gender Difference and the Production of Subjectivity", In J. Henriques *et al* , (Eds.), Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation, and Subjectivity (pp.227-265). London: Methuen.

Kennedy, M. (Ed.) (1987).Climbing: Women's Issue. (Special Issue), No.103, August.

Kennison, J. (1989). "Sex Roles and the Camping Experience". Camping Magazine, pp.9-10, November-December.

Kitzinger, C. (1990). "The Rhetoric of Pseudoscience". In I. Parker and J. Shotter (Eds.), Deconstructing Social Psychology (pp.61-75). London: Routledge.

Klint, K. A. (1990). "New Directions for Inquiry into Self-Concept and Adventure Experiences". In J. Miles and S.Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education (pp.163-172). State College, PA: Venture.

Knapp, C. (1985). "Escaping the Gender Trap: The Ultimate Challenge for Experiential Educators". Journal of Experiential Education. Vol.8, No.2, pp.16-19.

Kraft, R. (1985). "Towards a Theory of Experiential Learning" In R. Kraft and M. Sakofs (Eds.). The Theory of Experiential Education. (2nd ed.), (pp.4-35). , Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

LaBastille, A. (1980). Women and Wilderness. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Laurence, M. and Stuart, T. (1990). "The Use of Adventure in Reducing and Preventing Socially Deviant Youth Behaviour" In J. Miles and S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education. (pp.379-383). State College, PA: Venture.

Marshall, J. (1993). "Foucault and Education". Australian Journal of Education. Vol.33, No.2, pp.99-113.

May, T. (1993). Between Genealogy and Epistemology: Psychology, Politics, and Knowledge in the Thought of Michel Foucault. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

McClintock, M. (1991). "Lesbian Baiting and Gay Baiting: How Homophobia is a Tool of Sexism", In C. Birmingham (Ed.), Proceedings from the 1991 Association for Experiential Education Conference (pp.191-194). Boulder: Association for Experiential Education.

Meier, J. et al. (Eds.). (1987). High Adventure Outdoor Pursuits: Organization and Leadership. (2nd ed.). Columbus: Publishing Horizons.

Miles, J. and Priest, S. (Eds.). (1990). Adventure Education. State College: Venture.

Miner, J. (1990). "The Creation of Outward Bound", In J. Miles and S. Priest (Eds.), Adventure Education. (pp.55-66). State College: Venture.

Miner, J. and Boldt, J. (1981). Outward Bound U.S.A.: Learning Through Experience in Adventure-Based Education. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Miranda, W. and Yerkes, R. (1982). "The Need for Research in Outdoor Education Programs for Women". Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Vol.53, No.4, pp.82-85.

Mitten, D. (1992). "Empowering Girls and Women in the Outdoors". Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance. pp.56-60, February.

Mitten, D. (1985). "A Philosophical Basis for a Women's Outdoor Adventure Program". Journal of Experiential Education. Vol.8, No.2, pp.20-24.

Niemi, J. and Wieser, B. (Eds.). (1987). Rivers Running Free: Stories of Adventurous Women. Minneapolis: Bergamot.

Peterson, C. (1987). "The Right to Risk", In J. Meier *et al* (Eds.) High Adventure Outdoor Pursuits: Organization and Leadership (pp.43-48). Columbus: Publishing Horizons.

Pilgrim, D. (1990). "Researching Psychotherapy in Britain: The Limits of a Psychological Approach", In I. Parker and J. Shotter (Eds.), Deconstructing Social Psychology (pp.183-195). London: Routledge.

Priest, S. (1986). "Redefining Outdoor Education: A Matter of Many Relationships". Journal of Environmental Education. Vol.17, No.3, pp.13-15.

Raffan, J. (1992). "The Land as Teacher: Three Perspectives on a Northern Place", In G. Hanna (Ed.), Celebrating Our Tradition, Charting Our Future: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education (pp.199-200). Banff, AB: Association for Experiential Education.

Rubin, G. (1993). "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality", In H. Abelove *et al* (Eds.), The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader (pp.3-44). New York: Routledge.

Sarup, M. (1989). An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism. Athens: University of Georgia.

Sawicki, J. (1991). "Foucault and Feminism: Towards a Politics of Difference", In M. Lyndon Shanley and C. Pateman (Eds.), Feminist Interpretations and Political Theory (pp.217-231). Cambridge: Polity.

Schoel, J. *et al.* (1988). Islands of Healing: A Guide to Adventure Based Couselling. Hamilton, MA: Project Adventure.

Schulman, S. (1991). "Della Grace: Photos on the Margin of the Lesbian Community" In D. Grace, Love Bites (pp.4-6). London: GMP.

Scott, H. and Heine, M. (1992). "Inuit and Dene Traditional Games as Experiential Intercultural Learning Media", In G. Hanna (Ed.), Celebrating Our Tradition, Charting Our Future: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference of the Association for Experiential Education (pp.197-198). Banff, AB: Association for Experiential Education.

Scott, J. (1992). ""Experience"". In J. Butler and J. Scott (Eds.), Feminists Theorize the Political (pp.22-40). New York: Routledge.

Sedgwick, E. (1990). Epistemology of the Closet. Berkeley: University of California.

Tullis, J. (1986). Clouds From Both Sides. London: Grafton.

Unger, R. (1990). "Imperfect Reflection of Reality: Psychology Constructs Gender", In R. Hare-Mustin and J. Marecek (Eds.), Making a Difference: Psychology and the Construction of Gender (pp.102-149). New Haven: Yale University.

Vause, M. (1990). Rock and Roses: An Anthology of Mountaineering Essays. La Crescenta: Mountain N'Air.

Venn, C. (1984). "The Subject of Psychology" In J. Henriques *et al* , Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation, and Subjectivity (pp.119-152). London: Methuen.

Warren, K. (1985). "Women's Outdoor Adventures: Myth and Reality". Journal of Experiential Education. Vol.8, No.2, pp.10-14.

Watters, R. (1984). "Historical Perspectives of Outdoor and Wilderness Recreation Programming in the United States", In J. Miles and R. Watters (Eds.), Proceedings of the 1984 Conference on Outdoor Recreation: A Landmark Conference in the Outdoor Recreation Field. Bozeman, Montana.

Wetherell, M. (1986). "Linguistic Repertoires and Literary Criticism: New Directions for a Social Psychology of Gender". In S. Wilkinson (Ed.), Feminist Social Psychology: Developing Theory and Practice (pp.77-96). Milton Keyes: Open University Press.

Wilkinson, S. (Ed.). (1986). Feminist Social Psychology: Developing Theory and Practice. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Wright, A. (1987). "Youth Development Through Outdoor Adventure Programs", In J. Meier *et al* (Eds.), High Adventure Outdoor Pursuits: Organization and Leadership (pp.77-91). Columbus: Publishing Horizons.